Class ____ Book ____

MURRAY LIBRARY

Presented by

_____

ANCIENT ITALY

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2026

https://archive.org/details/ancientitaly0000etto

PLATE I

Castle of Ischia

ANCIENT ITALY

HISTORICAL AND GEOGRAPHICAL INVESTIGATIONS
IN CENTRAL ITALY, MAGNA GRAECIA
SICILY, AND SARDINIA

BY
ETTORE PAIS

TRANSLATED FROM THE ITALIAN
BY
C. DENSMORE CURTIS

913.37
P16

CHICAGO
THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS
LONDON
T. FISHER UNWIN, 1 ADELPHI TERRACE
1908

Copyright 1907 By
The University of Chicago

Published January 1908

Composed and Printed By
The University of Chicago Press
Chicago, Illinois, U. S. A.

TO

PROFESSORS DANA CARLETON MUNRO

MOSES STEPHEN SLAUGHTER

AND

FREDERICK JACKSON TURNER

OF THE UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

IN REMEMBRANCE OF THE YEAR

WHEN I WAS THEIR COLLEAGUE

Lake Erie College

10698

AUTHOR'S PREFACE

The papers incorporated in the present volume were written in part during the last few years, in part at a much earlier period. The earlier productions were printed in the proceedings of various Italian societies, or in separate pamphlets for private distribution, and in either case came before a very limited public.

I am led to offer this volume to the English-speaking public, both because it presents practically unpublished material, and because of the close connection between the various subjects of which it treats, since all were suggested by my researches in preparing my *History of Magna Graecia and Sicily* and my *History of Rome.*

E. P.

TRANSLATOR'S PREFACE

In translating this volume it has been my aim to reproduce the articles exactly as they were written. Owing to the difference between English and Italian idiom, it at first seemed necessary to modify the text to some extent in order to produce readable English. After a little practice, however, it became evident that such modifications were not only unnecessary, but even inadvisable, and the translation as it stands follows the order of presentation of the original material very closely.

The chapter on the Temple of the Sirens was translated by a college student while Professor Pais was in this country two years ago, and appeared in the *American Journal of Archaeology*. The translation is good, but to my mind loses force because of the number of changes made in the arrangement of the material. It has been practically retranslated for the present volume.

In his preface Professor Pais has alluded to the limited public to which these articles were presented. He himself did not possess a copy of the chapter on Strabo, and after writing to those of his friends to whom the few pamphlets which were printed had been presented, was able to secure but a single copy, and that from Professor Beloch in Germany.

I am greatly indebted to Professor Pais for his kindness in explaining the various points concerning which I was in doubt. I spent nearly a week at his villa near Naples while engaged upon the translation, and was thus enabled to secure his advice in many cases where my own ignorance of the subject-matter might have led to error.

C. D. C.

LIST OF ILLUSTRATIONS

PAGE

Plate I. Castle of Ischia (see chap. xvi) . . . . Frontispiece

Fig. 1. Coins of the Auruncians (see pp. 2 f.) 26

Fig. 2. Coin of the alliance between Temesa and Croton (see p. 43) 51

Fig. 3. Coins of Terina 52

Fig. 4. Coin of the alliance between Sybaris and Posidonia (see p. 83) 66

Fig. 5. Coin of the alliance between Siris and Pyxus (see p. 83). 86

Plate II. Eryx, facing 112

Fig. 6. Coin of Ergetium 116

Fig. 7. Coin of Ergetium 116

Fig. 8. Coin of Naxos 116

Plate III. Archaic relief from S. Mauro, facing 132

Plate IV. Ancient column near the Assinarus, facing . . . 148

Plate V. Etruscan column at Pompeii, facing 174

Fig. 9. Coins of Hyria (see chap. xv) 180

Fig. 10. Coin of Fenser (see chap. xv) 180

Plate VI. Archaic head from Temple of the Sirens, facing . . 214

Fig. 11. Peninsula of Sorrento 214

Plate VII. Inscription referring to cult of Athena Siciliana, facing 218

Plate VIII. Funerary relief (front of slab shown in Plate VII), facing 218

Plate IX. Enna (Castrogiovanni), facing 250

Plate X. Gate of the Citadel, Perugia, facing 368

Plate XI. Relief and Inscription from Sardinia, facing . . . 372

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		PAGE
I.	Ausonia and the Ausonians	1
II.	The Alliance between Regium and Tarentum against the Iapygians	27
III.	The Legend of Euthymus of Locri	39
IV.	Terina, the Colony of Croton	53
V.	The Origin of Siris	67
VI.	The Harbor of Satyrium	87
VII.	Thuriae	91
VIII.	The Expedition of Alexander of Epirus to Italy	99
IX.	Eryx=Verruca?	111
X.	Ergetium and Naxos	117
XI.	Piacus	123
XII.	The Archaic Greek Relief of S. Mauro and the Ancient Cities of the Heraean Plateau	131
XIII.	The Defeat of the Athenians at the Assinarus	147
XIV.	The Pretended Expedition of Agathocles against ΦΟΙΝΙΚΗ	157
XV.	The Daunians and Umbrians of Campania	163
XVI.	Concerning the Early History of Ischia	181
XVII.	Naples and Ischia at the Time of Sulla	205
XVIII.	The Temple of the Sirens near Sorrento	213
XIX.	The Cult of Athena Siciliana and the ΑΘΗΝΑΙΟΝ of Punta della Campanella	217
XX.	Siceliot Elements in the Earliest History of Rome	233
XXI.	Italiot, Samnite, and Campanian Elements in the Earliest History of Rome	303

XXII. The Greek Fleet which Appeared off the Coast of Latium in 349 B. C. 345

XXIII. Concerning the Early History of Pisa . . . 355

XXIV. An Error in Appian concerning the *Bellum Perusinum* 367

XXV. Concerning Two Greek Inscriptions Found in Sardinia 371

XXVI. Concerning the Time and Place in Which Strabo Composed His Historical Geography 379

Appendix 429

Index 433

I

AUSONIA AND THE AUSONIANS

I

From a period at least as early as the fifth century B. C. Greek writers have counted the Ausonians among the oldest peoples of Italy, and have given the name of Ausonia to a certain more or less extended portion of the peninsula.[1] There is some controversy, however, concerning the exact location of the home of this people, and also concerning the historical events which led to their growth in power and subsequent decay. The subject is worthy of attention, both because ancient writers do not entirely agree in the matter, and because modern authorities do not seem to have derived all the information possible from the fragments from ancient writers at our command. Certain modern critics, for example, have erred in assigning to the Ausonians a much smaller expanse of territory than that which they really occupied, and have not properly valued a series of references which deserve more attention. They have also neglected to take into consideration a number of ancient geographical names which still exist, and which will enable us to determine with much greater accuracy the amount of territory which this people in reality occupied.

According to Polybius, as quoted by Strabo, the Ausonians and the Opicians of Campania were two distinct peoples.[2] Hellanicus also mentions them as if they were separate peoples.[3] On the other hand, Antiochus, as quoted by Strabo in the passage mentioned and also Aristotle, in a passage which we shall discuss

[1] Among the various passages which allude to the Ausonians as the earliest inhabitants of Italy (cf. Dion. Hal. i. 35 extr.) should be noted Aelian. *V. H.* ix. 16, who speaks of the centaur Μάρης as the earliest indigenous inhabitant. This name "Mares" is of course associated with that of the goddess Marica, who was honored at Minturnae (which is on Ausonian territory), and who is mentioned by Vergil (vii. 47) in connection with Laurentum (cf. Serv., *ad loc.*). An archaic Latin inscription (*CIL*, I. 175) shows that her cult also existed at Pesaro.

[2] Strab. v, p. 242 C. [3] Antioch. and Hellan. apud Dion. Hal. i. 22.

shortly, and which is possibly derived from Antiochus, speak of the Ausonians and Opicians as one people.[1] It may be that the original text of Hellanicus mentioned these peoples as two branches of a single race, and perhaps the source of Polybius had in mind the same idea, especially since it is only the explicit statement of Strabo that the ancient Syracusan historian held the contrary view that prevents our deriving from still another fragment of Antiochus that the Opicians and Ausonians were two separate peoples.

According to the passage in Aristotle alluded to above, the Opicians were also called Ausonians and inhabited the regions on the side toward the Tyrrhenian Sea. Moreover, they belonged to the same Oenotrian race as did the Chones (Χῶνες), who dwelt near the Iapygians in the territory of Siris on the Sallentine peninsula. We have additional proof of the exactness of the information of Antiochus in the other passages which make mention of the Ausonians in Campania at Nola and at Sorrento,[2] and also in the name of the Auruncians, who inhabited the regions bordering on the Pomptine marshes, and extending from Terracina to Cales and Volturno. That *Ausoni* and *Aurunci* are two forms of the same name was recognized by Cluverius, and is now generally admitted.[3] Even today in the Auruncian territory the name of the Ausonians appears in that of the river Ausente and its tributary, the Ausentiello, which mingle their waters with those of the Garigliano not far from the ancient Minturnae. Thus the identity of the Ausonians and Auruncians, although it is of aid in better determining one of the regions in which the name of this people has been

[1] Strab. *loc. cit.;* Aristot. *Polit.* vii. (10) 9. 3, p. 1339 Bk.

[2] Νῶλα πόλις Αὐσόνων is the statement attributed to Hecataeus by Stephen of Byzantium, s. v. It is true, however, that the extracts from Hecataeus in Stephen are often open to suspicion (cf. the well-known fragment concerning Capua), and that Callimachus (apud Athen. *Ep.* ii, p. 270, Schw.) alluded explicitly to a falsification of the works of Hecataeus. On the other hand, there is no reason for believing that the legend of Auson who went from Sorrento to Lipari, and that of his sons who occupied the eastern and northern shores of Sicily (see Diod. v. 7; cf. Eust. ad Dion. Perieg., vss. 461–67) do not contain elements referring to the expansion of the Ausonian race along all of these shores.

[3] Cluverius, *Italia Antiqua* (Lugduni Batav., 1624), II, pp 1048 ff.; Nissen, *Ital. Landeskunde,* II, 2, pp 656 ff.

preserved, has on the other hand, been an obstacle to the recognition of the extent of the region which they occupied.

An ancient writer informs us that the Ausonians originally inhabited the region in which Cales and Beneventum were located;[1] but an eminent modern critic has denied the historical value of this statement, which he says to be of literary origin, and to have made its first appearance in the Alexandrine age.[2] In like manner, another prominent critic has asserted that not until the Alexandrine age was the term "Ausonian" used to designate the Siculian or Ionian Sea.[3] According to capable modern critics also, it was not till this period that the name was applied to a more or less extensive portion of the Italian peninsula situated beyond the borders of the Auruncian land. We shall see shortly that these statements are erroneous. The confusion is in part due to a misleading passage in Strabo. After affirming that, although the Oscans had disappeared, there still existed traces of them in the language which the Romans used under special circumstances, Strabo continues as follows: "And although the Ausonians never dwelt near the Siculian Sea, nevertheless one calls that sea Ausonian."[4] In opposition to this, Strabo himself affirms that Temesa, on the border of Bruttium, was originally an Ausonian city.[5] This coincides with the statement of Cato the Elder, who affirms that the Auruncians were at an early period established in the territory of Taurianum near the confines of Chalcidian Regium.[6] The presence of the Ausonians on the Ionian coast has recently been made certain by the discovery of a fragment of Pindar, in

[1] Paul. *Ep. Fest*, p. 18 M., s. v. *Ausoniam;* for Cales see also Dion. Hal. apud Steph. Byz., s. v. Καλησία. Beneventum is possibly the Μαλάνιος which Hecataeus (apud Steph. Byz.) placed in the interior of Oenotria.

[2] Huelsen, in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclop., II, 2, col. 2561: "Die Localisierung des Namens auf die Gegend zwischen Cales und Benevent ist gelehrte Erfindung."

[3] Nissen, *Ital. Landeskunde*, I, p. 95; cf. p. 65, n. 6

[4] Strab. v, p. 232 C.: τῶν δ' Αὐσόνων οὐδ' ἅπαξ οἰκησάντων ἐπὶ τῇ Σικελικῇ θαλάττῃ, τὸ πέλαγος ὅμως Αὐσόνιον καλεῖται.

[5] Strab. vi, p. 255 C.: Τεμέσῃ . . . . Αὐσόνων κτίσμα.

[6] Cato apud Prob. in Verg. *Buc. et Georg.*, p. 326, ed. Thilo et Hagen fr. 71, Peter.

which the region where Epizephyrian Locri was situated is termed Ausonian.[1]

The Opician Ausonians had, moreover, occupied Bruttium, the modern Calabria. According to Antiochus of Syracuse, the Opician Oenotrians had driven the Siculi from Bruttium and forced them over to Sicily.[2] We have seen that, according to Antiochus, the Opician Oenotrians were the same as the Ausonians. According to Hellanicus also, the Ausonians invaded southern Bruttium and forced the Siculi across to Sicily,[3] and Thucydides, probably following Antiochus, as has often been noted, affirmed that the Opicians had driven the Siculi from that region.[4]

On the whole, it is evident that in the fifth century B. C. the Ausonians were held to have been the earliest inhabitants on the shores of southern Bruttium. The many allusions of Lycophron to the Ausonians, when speaking of Scylla and the Strait of Messina, and of Petelia and Croton on the Ionian coast, were not new literary creations, as certain modern writers have held, but merely repeated the early traditions referring to the presence of the Ausonians on those shores; and here, as elsewhere, Lycophron showed himself a faithful follower of early writers.[5]

It does not require many words to show the error of those who hold that not until Alexandrine times was the Siculian Sea termed Ausonian. The sea in question extended from Sicily to the shores of Iapygia and the mouth of the Adriatic, not far from the borders of Epirus. We are told expressly by ancient writers that the name of Ausonian preceded that of Siculian for this sea,[6] and we have no reason to doubt their statements. The great expansion of Sicilian commerce, and the power of Syracuse after

[1] *Oxyrh. Pap.* iii. 408, 586.

[2] Antioch. apud Dion. Hal. i. 22; and apud Strab. vi, p. 257 C.

[3] Hellan. apud Dion. Hal. i. 22. According to Hellanicus, the Ausonians were driven over to Sicily on account of the invasion of the Iapygians.

[4] Thuc. vi. 2. 4.

[5] Lycophr. *Alex.*, vss. 44, 922.

[6] Strab. ii, p. 123 C., says expressly: *τὸ Αὐσόνιον μὲν πάλαι, νῦν δὲ καλούμενον Σικελικόν* (i. e., *πέλαγος*); cf. ii, p. 128 C.; vii, p. 324 C.; Polyb. apud Plin. *N. H.* iii. 75; *ibid.*, 14. 95: "in tres sinus recedens Ausoni maris, quoniam Ausones tenuere primi;" cf. *ibid.*, 151; xiv. 69; Eustach. ad Dion. Perieg., vs. 78.

the beginning of the fifth century, explain very well why the sea between Greece and Sicily should be termed Siculian. It is also easy to understand why this new name superseded that of Ausonian, which had been given the sea on account of the ancient Ausonian inhabitants of its shores. That the Ausonians really dwelt there is shown not only by the statement of Ephorus, according to whom they were driven from their homes by the Iapygians, but also by the recently quoted passage from Aristotle. According to this passage, which agrees perfectly with the statements of Antiochus and was probably derived from him, both the Chones, who inhabited the territory of Siris on the Tarentine gulf, and the Opician Ausonians, whom we have already found in Bruttium, in Campania, and near the Pomptine marshes, were of Oenotrian descent, and belonged to the same people to whom Italus gave his laws.[1]

Lycophron, however, does not limit himself to giving the name of Ausonian to the region situated on the shores of the Siculian or Ionian Sea, and to that occupied by Campania. He also mentions the Ausonians in connection with Daunia and the myth of Diomede.[2] It does not seem that we should regard this as an innovation of the Alexandrine poet. The best proof that in this case also he followed early sources is given by a passage in Pseudo-Scylax, where, after speaking of the Iapygians who inhabited the region between the Tarentine peninsula and Mount Orion or Garganus, reference is made to the neighboring Samnites. The Samnites occupied the territory extending from Mount Garganus to the land of the Umbrians and to Ancona. Among them the Greek historian records five peoples: the Laterni, Opici, Cramones, Boreontini, and Peucetii (§ 15). Few passages have been so maltreated by critics at this. The fact that certain of the peoples mentioned are unknown has led to attempts to amend the text by various conjectures, and the mention of the Opicians as dwelling toward the Adriatic has led to strange errors. Critics have over-

[1] Aristot. *Polit.* vii. (10) 9. 3, p. 1339 Bk.: *οἴκουν δὲ τὸ μὲν πρὸς τὴν Τυρρηνίαν Ὀπικοὶ καὶ πρότερον καὶ νῦν καλούμενοι τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν Αὔσονες, τὸ δὲ πρὸς τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ τὸν Ἰόνιον Χῶνες τὴν καλουμένην Σίριν · ἦσαν δὲ καὶ Χῶνες Οἰνοτροὶ τὸ γένος.*

[2] Lycophr., *Alex.*, vss. 593, 615, 1047.

looked the fact that the author had already described the Tyrrhenian shores, having at that time made mention of the Campanians and Samnites (§§ 10, 11), and have wrongly supposed that he here describes peoples inhabiting the Mediterranean side of the peninsula. The truth is that Pseudo-Scylax was describing a circumnavigation and mentioned only the peoples on the coast, not those in the interior; and among the peoples inhabiting the plains or the mountains near the Adriatic coast, between Mount Garganus and Ancona, must be sought the five above-mentioned tribes, who spoke five different dialects. Of the Laterni and Cramones we know nothing. The Boreontini probably inhabited certain of the mountains, which in that region often reach to the sea. The Peucetii were evidently the inhabitants of Picenum and Asculum, names which reappear in those of the Peucetii and of Asculum in Apulia. The name of the Opicians indicates clearly that, just as the Samnites had established themselves on the Adriatic and Tyrrhenian shores, so the Opicians had settled in the neighborhood of both seas. In like manner we find traces of Lucanians and Daunians on both shores.[1]

We have already noted that in the country of the Auruncians, not far from Minturnae, the modern names of the Ausente and Ausentiello recall the ancient Opician Ausonians, who were among

[1] Pseud.-Scyl., vs. 15: Σαυνῖται ἐν δὲ τούτῳ τῷ ἔθνει γλῶσσαι ἤτοι στόματα τάδε· Λατέρνιοι, Ὀπικοί, Κράμονες, Βορεοντῖνοι, Πευκετιεῖς. Müller, *G. G. M.*, I, p. 24, gives extracts from the comments of Niebuhr, Grotefend, and Mommsen. In the Λατέρνιοι some recognize the Leuterni of the Sallentine peninsula, or of Liternum in Campania. The name is unknown to me. By way of conjecture we might read Ἀτέρνιοι, and think of the people dwelling near the Aternus; but this is purely hypothetical. The Ὀπικοί have suggested the strange correction to Ἀπουλοί. Without reason the Κράμονες have been brought into relation with the Samnite Καρακῆνοι of Ptol. iii. 1. 58. The name of the Βορεοντῖνοι (which recalls the form Βορείγονοι which Lycophr. *Alex.*, vs. 1253 applies to the aborigines of the Abruzzi, the modern Borini, and which signifies "mountain people") has been emended by Grotefend and Niebuhr to Βρεντεσῖνοι. Through a misunderstanding of this passage in Pseudo-Scylax, Niebuhr supposes that it was out of place, although it is really in its proper position. And through a like misunderstanding Mommsen was obliged to suppose that the author was alluding to the Opicians of Campania, and to Liternum or Linternum, or to Nuceria Alfaterna of that same region.

the first to occupy these regions in historic times. It may be noted that even today not far from the ancient Sagrus (the modern Sangro), and parallel to it, flows the river Osento, which takes its origin in the mountains of Atessa and empties into the Adriatic not far from the modern Torino di Sangro. "Osento" is evidently a contracted form of "Ausento," and we have proof of the existence of the Opician Ausonians on the Adriatic as well as on the Tyrrhenian shores. There is, however, evidence for the modern name of Ausente in more than this one region. According to a most credible statement of Verrius Flaccus, the Ausonians originally occupied the inland region of the Apennines where Cales and Beneventum are located today. If we examine on a map the region lying between Beneventum, on the one hand, and Mount Vultur and the borders of ancient Daunia, on the other, not far from ancient Aquilonia (Lacedonia) we come upon the river Laosento, which flows into the Aufidus on the slopes of Mount Vultur before reaching the Adriatic. The form "Lausento" stands in the same relation to "Osento" and to "Ausente" as that of the neighboring "Lacedonia" stands to the ancient "Aquilonia." In like manner, in various regions of southern Italy the form "Lavella" bears the same relation to "Avella" as the modern name of "Lamone" in Romagna to the ancient "Anemum." Not far from Monteverde, near the Lausento or Ausento, there still exist traces of Cyclopaean walls—a fact, however, which has little bearing on the ethnical side of our problem. Of more importance are the mention of the Adriatic Opicians in Pseudo-Scylax, and the evidence of the two rivers Osento and Ausento, both of which facts make it more than probable that here as elsewhere Lycophron echoed faithfully the early traditions which located the Ausonians on the shores of Daunia. With the statement of Lycophron, moreover, agrees the passage in Appian to the effect that Sipontum in Daunia was termed an Ausonian city.[1]

We have already noticed that, according to Hellanicus, the Iapygians drove the Ausonians from their territory.[2] It is quite

[1] App. *B. C.* v. 56. From the context of the two following chapters it would seem that Appian also located Thurii and Consentia in Ausonia.

[2] Hellan. apud Dion. Hal. i. 22.

possible that this may have happened in Daunia as well as in Bruttium. According to Ephorus, as quoted by Strabo, the Iapygians dwelt near Croton.[1] It may be suspected that Ephorus derived this from the *τῶν Ἰαπυγίων ἄκραι τρεῖς*, or from the three promontories of the Iapygians which were situated near the famous Italiot city.[2] If that is true, Ephorus acted after the manner of modern critics, and in default of historical evidence resorted to reconstructive arguments. It does not follow that he was wrong in so doing. Through similar means modern criticism often arrives at the truth. It is worthy of note that Pseudo-Scymnus, whose contact with Ephorus is well known, also locates the Oenotrians between Croton, the Iapygians, and Brindisi, and that his statements correspond to other data which rest on the authority of Hecataeus and Strabo.[3] Certainly there was a time when the name of Ausonia was applied to a large portion of southern Italy; and quite possibly Verrius Flaccus drew from the ancient authors who had spoken of such an extension, when he wrote that Ausonia was originally the portion of Italy where Cales and Beneventum were located, and that the name was gradually extended to apply to the entire portion of the peninsula which was bordered by the Apennines.[4]

[1] Ephor. apud Strab. vi, p. 262 C.

[2] Strab. vi, p. 261 C.

[3] Pseud.-Scymn., vs. 363.

[4] Paul. *Ep. Fest.*, p. 18 M., s. v.: "Ausoniam appellavit Auson, Ulixis et Calypsus filius, eam primam partem Italiae, in qua sunt urbes Beneventum et Cales; deinde paulatim tota quoque Italia quae Apennino finitur, dicta est Ausonia ab eodem duce, a quo conditam fuisse Auruncam etiam ferunt." Cf. Lycophr. *Alex.*, vs. 702, where there is a reference to Mount Ades, from which flowed all of the streams and fountains which watered the Ausonian territory. According to the commentators (see the excellent edition of E. Ciaceri [Catania, 1901], p. 238), the Ades is the same as the Apennines; cf. Polyb. iii. 110; Cic. *De orat.* iii. 19. 69; Lucan. ii. 403 ff.

Besides the cities of the Auruncan region, and besides Cales and Beneventum, the names of three other Ausonian cities have come down to us; i. e., *Μαμάκρινα*, *Βεσκία*, and *Πέδα* (Steph. Byz., s. vv.). The first is entirely unknown to us, and possibly here, as elsewhere in Stephen, the name is corrupt. Perhaps *Μαμάκρινα* is the *Μακρῖνα* spoken of by Strabo (v, p. 251 C.), who, however, calls it a *Τυρρηνῶν κτίσμα οἰκούμενον ὑπὸ Σαυνιτῶν*. Possibly we have to deal with a repetition of the first syllable similar to that in *Βέβρυκες* (from *Φρύγες*) and *Mamers* (from *Mars*). In this case it must be that the Oenotrians occupied Marcina near Salerno

When, in another passage, Lycophron speaks of Caere in Etruria as a city situated in Ausonia, he is not alone in so doing.[1] Neither Verrius Flaccus nor Lycophron expresses personal opinions; nor do they represent the result of late literary speculation. This is shown by the writings of Antiochus; by the author of the periplus, known by the name of Scymnus of Chios, who depended, it seems, on Apollodorus; and finally by the annalistic sources of Livy and Dionysius. From the statements of Livy we learn with all certainty that within historic times the Ausonians not only occupied the region more specifically termed Auruncian, which extended from the Pomptine marshes to Mount Massicus and to the extinct volcano of Rocca Monfina, but they that extended as far as Cales.[2] Pseudo-Scymnus has occasion to speak twice of the Ausonians. In one place he says that they inhabited the inland region closely adjoining the territory of the Latins. The second time he speaks of them as dwelling beside the Samnites, who occupied the southern shores of Campania, and who lived, therefore, in the regions bordering on the territory of Benevetum.[3] A careful interpretation

before the Etruscans. Βεσκία is the same as the Vescia which Livy (viii. 11, 9, 25) calls a city of the Ausonians. Πέδα is the Latin *Pedum*.

[1] Lycophr. *Alex.*, vs. 1355.

[2] According to the tradition in Livy (ii. 8), about 504 B. C., the Auruncians occupied Pometia and Cora, taking them from the Latins, and in 495 they pushed almost as far as Aricia (ii. 26). In 337 they occupied Suessa Aurunca (viii. 15), at which time they also took Cales, which is called Ausonian ("ea gens Cales urbem incolebat," viii. 16). In 314 the Ausonians captured and destroyed Minturnae and Vescia, the cities of Auson, and Livy (ix. 25) adds on this occasion: "delataque Ausonum gens." According to Roman tradition, the Ausonians were gradually driven back, on the one hand by the Latins, on the other by the Samnites (cf. Livy, ix. 25), and this in general corresponds to the truth.

[3] Pseud.-Scymn., vss. 228 ff, after having mentioned Latinus, son of Ulysses and Circe, says: *Αὔσονές τε μεσόγειον τόπον | ἔχοντες Αὔσων οὓς συνοικίσαι δοκεῖ Ὀδυσσέως παῖς καὶ Καλυψοῦς γενόμενος;* and then again, after having spoken of Cumae and Neapolis in Campania, he recalls the Samnites (cf. Pseud.-Scyl., vss. 10, 11), *παροικοῦσ' ἐχόμενοι τῶν Αὐσόνων* (vss. 244 ff.), by which perhaps he alludes both to the Ausonians of Nola and to the population which was pressing into the interior of the Samnite territory. In like manner, shortly afterward (vs. 246) Pseudo-Scymnus mentions the Oenotrians who inhabited the inland district behind Posidonia (Paestum). Both Verrius Flaccus and Pseudo-Scymnus, in giving the well-known legend referring to Auson, son of Circe, and to Calypso (cf. above, and

of the fragments of Antiochus, as compared with the passages from Hellanicus, Thucydides, and, above all, Aristotle, who, according to the majority of critics, derived his material from Antiochus himself, shows that, according to this writer, and, indeed, according to all the historians of the fifth century B. C., the Opician Ausonians once occupied the entire region of Italy situated between the Ionian Sea and the shores of Bruttium, on the one hand, and the Tyrrhenian Sea, on the other. Ausonia itself however, as is expressly stated by Verrius Flaccus, was that region of Italy which was bounded by the Apennines; and with this fact in mind one better understands the numerous passages in Vergil alluding to Ausonia and the Ausonians.

According to the opinion which is today generally accepted and defended by the best critics, Vergil, on a par with other writers of the Alexandrine period, by the use of poetic license applied the words "Ausonia" and "Ausonians" to regions which that people never inhabited. Latium for example he called Ausonia, and the indigenous inhabitants of that region, against whom Aeneas had to contend, he termed Ausonians. In Vergil the Tiber is Ausonian, and so is the spear which killed the Greek Pallas. The Rutulian Turnus, too, is called Ausonian, and all of the Rutulians and Latins are held to be of that race.[1] Both ancient and modern critics agree that, instead of giving his fancy free rein in illustrating the early myths, Vergil generally followed very closely the ancient traditions. That the present instance is no exception, and that Vergil followed Lycophron, is shown by a passage in Aristotle

also the other passages relating to this in the article by Procksch on Auson in Roscher, I, 1, col. 734), cause us to wonder in what region this legend originated. It is possible, however, to apply it either to the shores of the Ausonian or Siculian Sea, or to those of Campania. In favor of the first hypothesis may be mentioned the fact that Pseudo-Scylax, vs. 13, and the source of Iambl. *Vit. Pyth.* 57, place the island of Calypso near Croton; cf. Plin. *N. H.* iii. 96. In regard to Campania, according to some writers Calypso was worshiped near Lake Avernus (Dio. Cass. 48. 50). Of the two hypotheses the first seems preferable.

[1] For the Tiber as Ausonian see *Aen.* v. 83; Turnus, xii. 183; the Rutulians, xii. 447, cf. xi. 41; Latium and the Latin cities, iv. 236; vii. 39, 55, 105, 198, 537, 547, 623; viii. 328; ix. 99, 639; x. 268; xi. 253; cf. iii. 171, 378, 385, 477; iv. 349; vi. 346; x. 54; in a more general sense, *Georg.* ii. 385.

which we know through Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In discussing the beginnings of Rome, Dionysius gives under the name of the Greek philosopher a tradition, according to which certain Greeks, on their way home from the Trojan war, were driven to a place in Opicia termed Latinion, situated on the shores of the Tyrrhenian Sea. Probably in this case also Aristotle followed Antiochus,[1] or at any rate followed an author who agreed perfectly with him. According to the source of Aristotle, this Latium on the Tyrrhenian coast formed part of the region occupied by the Opicians. According to Antiochus, the Opician Ausonians of southern Bruttium had pushed as far as the Tyrrhenian Sea, and Latium was included in their territory. And that these two writers were not alone in affirming this, we learn from the source of Lydus, from Stephen of Byzantium, and from a valuable passage in Cato the Elder. Lydus, in addition to certain false and remarkable statements, often gives information derived from ancient sources which had fallen into disuse, and in one such passage he states expressly that Laurentum was in ancient times termed a city of the Opicians.[2] Stephen declares the Latin Pedum to have been an Ausonian city.[3] Cato protests vigorously against those Greeks who, to offend the Romans, call them Opicians.[4] Evidently, therefore, we have to deal, not with isolated passages, but with a well-established tradition, according to which Latium formed a part of the territory occupied by the Opicians.[5] And since Antio-

[1] Aristot. apud Dion. Hal. i. 72: *ἐλθεῖν εἰς τὸν τόπον τοῦτον τῆς Ὀπικῆς ὃς καλεῖται Λατίνιον ἐπὶ τῷ Τυρρηνικῷ πελάγει κείμενος.* For the myth cf. Heracl. apud Sol. i. 2; Fest., s. v. *Romam*, p. 269 M.; Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 6; Serv. in *Aen.* i. 273. There is no need of changing *Λατίνιον* to *Λαουίνιον* as Kiessling does.

[2] Ioh. Lyd. *De mens.* i. 13. Aeneas was driven *ἐν πόλει τῆς Ἰταλίας λεγομένῃ Λαυρεντίᾳ, ἣν καὶ Ὀπικήν φασιν ὀνομασθήναί ποτε, ἐξ ἧς καὶ ὀπικίζειν καὶ (ὡς τὸ πλῆθος) ὀφφικίζειν τὸ βαρβαρίζειν Ἰταλοί λέγουσιν.* This *ὀφφικίζειν* mentioned by the source of Lydus should be compared with the statement of Steph. Byz., s. v.: *Ὀπικοὶ ἔθνος Ἰταλίας . . . . οἱ δὲ Ὀφικοὶ ἀπὸ τῶν ὄφεων.*

[3] Steph. Byz., s. v. *Πέδα.*

[4] Cato apud Plin. *N. H.* xxix. 14: "nos quoque diclitant barbaros et spurcius nos quam alios Opicon [i. e., *Ὀπικῶν*] appellatione foedant."

[5] That the Opicians in ancient times occupied territory bordering on Latium (i. e., the valley of the Trerus and that of the middle Liris) we learn from a frag-

chus, the earliest and most authoritative source in such questions, states that the Opicians were termed Ausonians, it follows that in this case also Vergil displayed his customary fidelity in following ancient literary tradition.

II

It now remains to discover from what country the Ausonians originally came, and in what way they were able gradually to spread themselves over all of southern Italy. There are two traditions referring to this question, one of which maintains that the Oenotrian-Opician Ausonians moved from the south toward the north, while the other holds that the Ausonians descended from the region in which Cales and Beneventum were situated, and conquered all of Italy as far as the Apennines. The first of these traditions is represented by Antiochus; the second, by Verrius Flaccus. According to Antiochus, as we have seen, the Opician Ausonians were one of the two main branches of the great Oenotrian race, and inhabited the Tyrrhenian side of the peninsula. The other branch, on the other hand, the Chones, occupied the territory of Siris bordering on Iapygia. A comparison of the name of the Chones in Italy with that of the Chaones in Epirus, and also of various other local names found in both regions, suggests rather an Epirot than an Italic origin. Acheruntia and Pandosia are purely Chaonic names, and are found in various portions of the region inhabited by the Italian Chonian Oenotrians. Moreover, these names, which are also of a purely Epirot character, appear not only in the territory of Siris, but also in other regions of southern Italy which were inhabited by Oenotrians. From a comparison of these names we must conclude that the Chones and the peoples coming from Epirus occupied, in addition to the Siritis, others of the regions which were inhabited by the Oenotrian tribes.[1]

ment of Dion. Hal. apud Steph. Byz., s. v.: *Φρέγελλα πόλις Ἰταλίας, ἣ τὸ μὲν ἀρχαῖον ἦν Ὀπικῶν ἔπειτα Οὐολούσκων ἐγένετο.*

[1] Pandosia and Acheruntia, names characteristic of the Epirot Chaonia, are found in the heart of Bruttium, in the valley of the Crathis (near modern Cosenza), where Alexander of Epirus perished (see e. g., Strab. vii, p. 324 C). In the Siritis we also have a city named Pandosia, near Heraclea (see Kaibel, *I. G. S. I.* 645,

However, although this Epirote emigration was very important, it could not possibly alone have furnished the entire population of southern Italy in ancient times. Without doubt there were numerous early invasions of peoples from the north, similar to those which throughout historic times have influenced the history of the southern regions of the peninsula. For this reason there is probably some truth in the statement of Verrius Flaccus to the effect that the Ausonians conquered all of Italy as far as the Apennines, starting out from the region where Cales and Beneventum were situated.

We shall, perhaps, more easily attain the desired solution of our problem if we examine the statements of ancient writers on the subject from a political as well as from an ethnographical point of view. By neglecting this, modern critics have often lost their way amid the intricate by-ways of Italic origins. Antiochus informs us that the earliest inhabitants of Italy were the Oenotrians, who originally inhabited the region extending from the southern part of Bruttium on the Strait of Messina, to the Napetine (S. Euphemia) and Scylacine Gulfs. Italus became their leader, and from him the Oenotrians took their new name. He transformed his followers from shepherds to tillers of the soil, and gave them good laws and precepts for their mutual intercourse. He was succeeded by Morges, under whom the Oenotrians, who under Italus were termed Italians, were called Morgetians. Under Morges the name of Italy was extended to apply to the region along the Tyrrhenian coast as far as Posidonia (Paestum), and along the Ionian or Ausonian Sea as far as Tarentum. When an old man, Morges gave shelter to an exile

1, 12) not far from the river Aciris. A third Acheruntia (the present Acerenza) was situated near Venusia, in the territory whose *fons Bandusiae* (Pandosia) was made famous by Horace. Other Acheruntiae are known near Croton (see *Nova Tactica*, 1791, ed. Gelzer; possibly near the present site of Cerentia Antica) and near the Alburno in the valley of the Tanager in eastern Lucania (see *An. Rav.*, IV, 34; cf. *Tab. Peut.* and *CIL*, X, p. 2). Finally, the name of Acherusia appears on the Campanian coast as applied to the well-known marsh near Cumae. In this, however, we probably have not a local name, but a localization of the necromantic myths of Thesprotia. The same holds for the sacrarium of Albunea near Tivoli (cf. Verg. *Aen.* vii. 81 ff.).

from Rome by the name of Siculus. This Siculus caused dissension among the Oenotrian people, and his followers, called after him Siculi, were forced by the Opicians and Ausonians to abandon Italy (i. e., southern Bruttium), and betook themselves to the neighboring island, which was named Sicily after them.[1]

At first sight it would seem that Antiochus was referring to the emigration of peoples of a different race. He says that Italus was of Oenotrian descent, and, according to Aristotle, he made the same statement in regard to the Chones. A close examination of such statements, however, shows that he was alluding to the political development of these peoples, and to the formation and subsequent expansion of the empire of the Oenotrians under the rule of Italus, Morges, and Siculus, who created the states of the Itali, Morgeti, and Siculi. The small state of the Itali, which at first occupied southern Bruttium, was gradually extended to form the larger Oenotrian state, and ended by embracing all of southern Italy as far as Paestum and Tarentum. With this political concept correspond the statements regarding the laws of the wise King Italus, who introduced agriculture and the practice of eating together from a common mess. The reference to the γένος, however, has only a secondary value as compared with the political fact which makes the account of especial significance. The

[1] Antioch. apud Dion. Hal. i. 12, 22, 35, 73; Strab. iv, pp. 253 f., 257 C.; cf. Arist. *Pol.* vii. 9. (10), p. 1339 Bk. Antiochus says that the names of *Italia* and *Itali* were at first restricted to the country and inhabitants of the region ἐντός the Napetine and Scylacine gulfs. The following reference to the extension of such names to the shores (παράλιος) of Tarentum and Posidonia shows that ἐντός cannot be taken in the sense of referring to the region comprised between the two gulfs (i. e., merely the region in which Cantanzaro and Tiriolo are situated), but that it refers to the territory *beyond*, and comprises all of southern Bruttium from Regium and Locri as far as Terina and Scylax. The successive extension of the name and realm of Italus and Morges as far as Tarentum on the one side, and Posidonia on the other, shows clearly that this is the only possible explanation. When Aristotle, in speaking of the original state of King Italus, refers to the λόγιοι τῶν ἐκεῖ κατοικούντων, he has in mind either Hippys of Regium or Antiochus of Syracuse, or some other Siceliot or Italiot historian. Whether Antiochus is correct in affirming that the name "Italia" arose in southern Bruttium is another question. Certainly the evidence of this author cannot be quoted in favor of the view that the name originated in Lucania, as has been done by certain Italian scholars whose writings on the subject contain many strange errors.

γένος serves to bring together different peoples and to unite them with a political yoke. Italus was an Oenotrian, just as the two brothers Oenotrius and Peucetius, according to Pherecydes, a fifth-century writer, were sons of Pelasgus, who left Arcadia and founded in Italy the two peoples of like name.[1] In reality, in Peucetius and the Peucetians we have a Greek form derived from πεῦκος, "pine." The Romans followed another etymology, calling them Poediculi. This would make them the same as the Piceni, who did not derive their name from the pine or πεῦκος, but from the bird which they called the *picus*. The derivation of the Peucetians from Arcadia is, however, the result of Greek literary and political speculation. Their relationship with the Oenotrians is derived from the fact that they originally occupied Apulia, and that even later they inhabited the regions bordering on Peucetia.[2] The Greek genealogy serves to unite peoples of different race which are joined for topographical and political reasons. Thus, at a later period, the Tarentines called themselves brothers of the Samnites and of the Calabrians. For like reasons even the Sabines were connected with the Spartans;[3] and as a result of similar speculation the Celtic Aedui were held to be related to the Roman people. According to Antiochus, Italus was an Oenotrian. In reality, the name of the Oenotrians and that of Oenotria has no clear and distinct significance from an ethical standpoint, as is manifestly affirmed by Pseudo-Scymnus when he says:

> ἥ δ' Ἰταλία προσεχὴς μὲν ἔστ' Οἰνωτρίᾳ
> μιγάδας τὸ πρότερον ἥτις ἔσχε βαρβάρους
> ἀπὸ τοῦ δυναστεύοντος Ἰταλοῦ τοὔνομα
> λαβοῦσα.[4]

This noteworthy passage may be derived indirectly from Antio-

[1] Pherecyd. apud Dion. Hal. i. 13; cf. Paus. viii. 3. 5.

[2] Hecat. apud Steph. Byz., s. v.: Πευκτίαντες ἔθνος τοῖς Οἰνώτροις προσεχές; cf. Pseud.-Scym., vs. 363, and Strab. vi, p. 265 C.

[3] The fictitious and political character of the relationship between the Tarentines and the Pitanatian Samnites was known to Strabo v, p. 250 C. For the Calabrians and Tarentum see the passages quoted in my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, p. 613.

[4] Vss. 300 ff.

chus, or it may be a late echo from some logographer of the fifth century. At any rate, it forms a useful complement to the statements of the ancient Syracusan historian.[1] It tells how Italus became the leader of a rough people of mixed descent (*βάρβαροι μιγάδες*), which agrees perfectly with the statement that he civilized this people and transformed them from shepherds into tillers of the soil. At a later period the Roman consul Popillius, in speaking of those who inhabited part of the same region, boasted that he had acted in the same manner in regard to the *ager publicus*.[2] It would seem that the name "Oenotrian" was first applied to those regions of Italy where Siris and Croton were located. Later it was extended to apply to other portions of southern Italy, enduring especially along the banks of the Alento, where Phocaean Velia was situated, and in the mountainous region about Mount Alburnus. It was used to indicate a people, ethnically different from the Chones, that came from Epirus and inhabited the Siritis, in the same way that the name "Italians" comprised successively peoples of different race which were subject to Italus. The same observation holds true for the Morgetes. We have shown that the generic designation "Oeontrians" was applied to all of these peoples, and not to the Opician Ausonians alone.[3] Thus the

[1] It is impossible to determine whether the lines of Pseudo-Scymnus are indirectly derived from Antiochus. C. Müller (*ad loc.*) rightly observes that Pseudo-Scymnus follows the views of Ephorus, and contrary to Antiochus enumerates Tarentum among the cities of Italy (vss. 330, 361). Probably many other writers on Italy in the fifth or fourth century alluded to this legend of King Italus.

[2] *CIL*, X, 6950, 13: "primus fecei ut de agro poblico aratoribus cederent paastores."

[3] Pandosia on the Crathis was the ancient seat of the Oenotrian kings, and figures as a city of importance even later, at the time of the war of Alexander of Epirus against the Brettians: Strab. iv, p. 256 C.; cf. the coins from the fifth century showing an alliance with Croton (Head, *Hist. num.*, p. 89). The name of Pandosia would lead us to consider the Pandosia of the Chones in the Siritis purely Oenotrian. This was called by Aristotle (*Pol.* vii. 9. (10), p. 1329 Bk. *Οἰνωτροὶ τὸ γένος*, and by Strabo (vi, p. 255 C.) *Οἰνωτρικὸν ἔθνος*, although Strabo elsewhere (vi, p. 253 C) names the *Χῶνας καὶ τοὺς Οἰνωτρούς*, as allied, but distinct, peoples. Some of the Oenotrian cities mentioned by Stephen of Byzantium, on the authority of Hecataeus, seem to have been located in the region above Croton where Pandosia and Acheruntia were situated. The name of *Ἀρίνθη*

examination of the earliest references to the first inhabitants of Italy leads to results similar to those reached by students of the biological sciences when, in seeking for the embryos and lowest organisms, they discover that even these are aggregations of various elements which demand further analysis and subdivision. In reality, Oenotria was occupied by the peoples that had crossed the sea from Epirus, and by others that had come to southern Italy from the north and from the Apennines.

The political and non-ethnographical character of the account of Antiochus is likewise shown by the boundaries which he assigns to the *ἀρχαία Ἰταλία*. It is true that he mentions Latium in connection with the Oenotrian-Opician Ausonians, since he states that from that region came Siculus, the successor of Morges, and founder of the race of Siculi in southern Bruttium and Sicily. The boundaries of ancient Italy, however, he fixes at Posidonia and Tarentum. Tarentum was just as much Greek as were the

(cf. s. v. *Ἀριάνθη*) *πόλις Οἰνωτρῶν ἐν μεσογαίᾳ* (Steph. Byz., s. v.) seems to have come down in that of the modern Arente, a confluent of the upper Crathis. *Μενεκίνη* (cf. s. v. *Ἰξιάς*) is identified by Calabrian writers as the locality today called Mendicino.

Unfortunately, we are unable to determine the location of *Βρυστακία* (the Aprustani of Pliny?), *Ἔριμον*, *Κυτέριον*, *Νίναια*, and *Κόσσα*, which Stephen, referring to Hecataeus, places in the interior of Oenotria, as well as that of *Πατυκός*, *Σιβερηνή* (Siderno?), and *Σέστιον*, which Stephen also terms Oenotrian cities without giving his source. Worthy of note is the name of *Μαλάνιος*, according to Hecataeus a *πόλις μεσογείας τῶν Οἰνωτρῶν*, because it reminds us of the *Malies* of the coins of the Campanian type which some attribute to Maleventum or Beneventum, and of the passage in Verrius Flaccus which located the Ausonians at Beneventum.

Velia too is said by Herodotus (i. 167) to be in Oenotria, and it is of interest to observe that, just as near Mount Alburnus there is mention of Aceronia, so opposite Velia were the Insulae Oenotrides (Strab. vi, pp. 252 C. extr., 258 C.), in the name of which Pliny (*N. H.* iii. 85) had already seen an "argumentum possessae ab Oenotris Italiae."

In Stephen (s. v.) among the cities of the Oenotrians is that of *Πύξις*, which may possibly be the same *Πύξους πόλις Σικελίας* or Buxentum which is mentioned immediately afterward. (See below, chapter xxi, for the meaning of *πόλις Σικελίας*.) Also *Ἀρτεμίσιον*, which Stephen cites on the authority of Philistus, is called a city of the Oenotrians *ἐν μεσογείᾳ*. We should expect to find a place on the coast, although it is quite possible that Greek cults penetrated into the interior. This occurred, for example, at Oenotrian Pandosia, and the coins show the existence of the cult of the Argive Juno.

neighboring Achaean and Chalcidaean cities,[1] and was probably excluded from Italy by Antiochus on account of its struggles with the Achaean cities, and especially with the purely Greek Thurii, for the possession of the Siritis. On the other hand, we know that after Tarentum had captured the Siritis, it located at Heraclea the center of the league of Italiot cities. We know also that Tarentum was considered an Italiot city by other ancient writers,[2] and it follows that Antiochus was writing from a political standpoint. If he made Italy extend only as far as Posidonia (Paestum) on the Tyrrhenian side, this is explained by the fact that about a century before his time the Etruscans had conquered a great portion of Campania, and had pushed as far as Salernum and the neighboring plain watered by the Silarus, which bordered the territory of Posidonia on the north.[3] The variety of the ethnographical elements comprised under the general name of Oenotrians, and the political reasons which inspired the account of Antiochus referring to the origin of the name *Italia*, prevent our affirming that the Opician Ausonians took their origin in southern Bruttium. More worthy of credence is the statement of Verrius Flaccus to the effect that the region of Cales and Beneventum was the starting-point of this people; although it is probable that, instead of being the place where the Ausonian race was created and whence it took its departure, it should be considered as the most northern point which had come to the knowledge of Verrius. We are unable to decide whether in the above instance the writer expressed the result of his own personal investigations, or whether he followed ancient historical sources. Nor can we decide whether traces of the Ausonian element near Cales and Beneventum led him to his conclusions, or whether at his time the Ansonians had entirely disappeared from that region, just as, according to Livy, they had been wholly destroyed in the region of the Auruncians.[4]

[1] Antioch. apud Strab. vi, p. 254 C., and Dion. Hal. i. 73.

[2] Strab. vi, p. 280 C. extr.

[3] See my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, pp. 530 ff.

[4] The statement of Livy in this connection is explicit, ix. 25. 9 (314 B. C.): "deletaque Ausonum gens."

In case he drew from others, it may have been from Cato the Elder, or some other Latin source; or it may have been from some Greek, and possibly Campanian, writer.

At any rate, the Osco-Ausonian element which we have found on both the Adriatic and the Tyrrhenian sides of the peninsula represents a very ancient stratum which was anterior to the invasions of the Iapygians, Etruscans, and Samnites.[1] Along the Adriatic coast the Opician Ausonians gave way before the Iapygian invasion, just as in Latium they were overcome, and in part destroyed, by the Etruscans, and later by the Sabines, who in the fifth century gained possession of Latium. The Auruncian or Ausonian inhabitants of the region situated between the Pomptine marshes and the Volturnus met a like fate at the hands of the Samnites, who in the fifth century gained possession of central Italy and overran the whole of the South. The same thing also occurred in the plain of Vesuvius, where first the Etruscans, and later the Samnite Campanians, oppressed the Opician Ausonian people. Even before this time, and certainly before Herodotus and Antiochus, the Italian peoples that had experienced the Sabine invasions, caused to be forgotten the ancient names and tribes of the Oenotrians, Ausonians, Morgetians, and Chonians.[2] But while in central Italy the name of the Ausonians long survived in the form of the Auruncians, and while on the borders of Latium, in Campania, and along the Adriatic coast, traces remained of the name of the Opicians, a different fate befell the Ausonians in southern Italy, who were either entirely destroyed or absorbed. We thus understand how Strabo, who drew from his sources the mention of the foundation of Temesa by the Ausonians at a time even earlier than Greek colonization, could have affirmed that the Ausonians

[1] For the Iapygians on the Adriatic coast on the borders of Umbria see *Tab. Iguv.*, VI b, 54, 58; VII a, 12, 48; cf. in Plin. *N. H.* iii. 113 the Dolates Salentini in the Sixth Region, or Umbria.

[2] Strab. vi, p. 253 C.: *πρὶν δὲ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐλθεῖν οὐδ' ἦσάν πω Λευκανοί· Χῶνες δὲ καὶ Οἰνωτροὶ τοὺς τόπους ἐνέμοντο. τῶν δὲ Σαυνιτῶν αὐξηθέντων ἐπὶ πολὺ καὶ τοὺς Χῶνας καὶ τοὺς Οἰνωτροὺς ἐκβαλόντων Λευκανούς δ' εἰς τὴν μερίδα ταύτην ἀποικησάντων · · · · πόλυν χρόνον ἐπολέμουν οἵ τε Ἕλληνες καὶ βάρβαροι πρὸς ἀλλήλους.*

had never inhabited the shores of the Ionian Sea, and yet have repeated the statement that at one time the Siculian Sea was termed Ausonian.

III

The above results have been reached by a study of ancient literary tradition. If we desire to consider our problem from every point of view, we must call to our aid the study of languages, of primitive archaeology, of toponomy, and of anthropology. The anthropologists, however, although they have made noteworthy progress in their investigations, are not yet able to furnish entirely trustworthy and final data. Even though we follow with the greatest sympathy and interest the results of craniological and somatological research, and recognize that certain of the hypotheses evolved are deserving of the most attentive consideration, we must nevertheless admit that the results are not yet mature, and that the work is not always conducted with unity of purpose. We must, therefore, observe caution in our consideration of the series of more or less ingenious and probable theories which have succeeded one another during the past few decades, and which, after attracting their share of attention from scientists, have easily made way for new, and often opposing, hypotheses, much in the way that one fashion is succeeded by another in other branches of human activity, such as in the use of garments and domestic utensils, and in social usage and ceremonies. Very little has been done toward determining with certainty and exactness the somatological and anatomical characteristics of the indigenous peoples in the mountainous regions of central Italy—a procedure which will some day furnish the key to more than one ethnical problem. In the same manner, notwithstanding the marvelous results obtained by comparative linguistics, sufficient attention has not as yet been paid to the sounds which have endured among the various Italian populations. Possibly through some such study we may in time be compensated for the scarcity of epigraphic material of a really ancient period, and, in part at least, be enabled to discover and reconstruct the singularities and affinities which are determined by the persistence of early elements of ethical character.

The archaeological material appears to be much more abundant, and the students of primitive archaeology—or, as they call it, paleology—have made laudible efforts at solving these difficult problems with new material. Certainly much praise is due those who have attempted to check, by means of the early archaeological material of the peninsula and the neighboring regions, the data furnished us by the ancient traditions. An examination of these studies, however, does not show that definite results have as yet been attained, nor that material has been discovered of such a nature as to furnish a foundation for substantial and incontrovertible conclusions when applied to problems similar to that which we have been discussing. The study of primitive archaeology has disclosed different burial customs and distinctive forms of pottery; but none of the discoveries as yet made has revealed an element of strikingly ethnical character. In Italy tombs in which the bodies were buried in a crouching position seem to have preceded those in which they were stretched out; but this characteristic has been noted elsewhere among peoples of different race, and it would be hazardous to draw any ethnographical conclusion from it. The earliest tombs show evidence of primitive and barbarous customs, such as scraping the flesh from the bones and painting the skulls; but analogous customs are found among savages in other parts of the globe. The excavations have brought to light many thousands of broken vessels, and fragments of vases and other utensils; but an examination of the style of such objects often shows elementary forms analogous to those which, by virtue of the psychological unity of the human mind, are found in other regions. When we come to deal with more highly developed forms and styles, we have come down to the beginning of history and find the key to the accounts of the first commercial relations existing between Greece, the islands of the Aegean, Illyricum, and Italy. None of the elements hitherto discovered throws sufficient light on Italic origins. On the other hand, it has been possible to prove that in certain regions of central and upper Italy there existed till a late historical period elements of ethnographical origin which have not as yet been well de-

fined, and which had long since disappeared in the southern regions of the peninsula.

There is no need of despairing for the future of these researches. The results attained from them will be of constantly increasing usefulness, and, when aided by strictly philological examinations of the texts, by the comparative history of civilization, and by the other modern auxiliary sciences, will be of the greatest value to the many students of primitive forms. As compared with the paleological investigations of a few years ago, the achievements of modern students of primitive archaeology show as great advances as those which separate the various periods of civilization which form the object of their studies. Notwithstanding this rapid progress, however, due to the greater learning of the younger investigators, in this case also we have as yet no incontrovertible data which will aid in the solution of our problem. This is partly owing to the strong foothold gained by the erroneous theories advanced by earlier investigators along this line, in the combating and setting-aside of which much valuable time has been lost.

There remains the study of toponomy, which by its nature is still more closely connected with historical and geographical researches. Unfortunately the pursuit of this study also has led to grave errors. Although the resemblance of names has at times been of assistance in tracing the distribution of various peoples, it has more often given occasion for investigations based merely on similarity of sounds, on simple homophony, and on elements pertaining to different peoples and times. Moreover, while in other parts of Europe research along this line has found expert advocates, in Italy it is still in its infancy, and its followers have many deep-seated prejudices to overcome. There is a lack of systematic and complete lists of names, and thus in only a few cases is it possible by means of methodical inquiry to establish the origin of local names which have survived. In spite of these drawbacks, however, and awaiting the day when we shall have more material at our disposal, let us now examine a few toponomical data which may be of assistance in solving the problem before us.[1]

[1] For the nature of the problems which may be solved by toponomy, and for

Students of toponomy long ago discovered that the ancient names of rivers and mountains endured much longer than those of cities. In the foregoing we have seen how the name of the early Ausonians is still preserved in the names of the rivers flowing through certain of the regions which were inhabited by the Opician-Ausonian race. An analogous phenonemon is presented by the river Aufidus, or Oufens, or Ufens, which flows through the Pomptine marshes on the borders of the Auruncian territory. This name is found both in the Aufidus, or Ofanto, of Apulia, and in Aufidena in the center of the Abruzzi, the region which was the cradle of the Samnite race and bore the same relation to ancient Italy as did Arcadia to the other portions of the Peloponnese. The same name, moreover, appears in the Aufinium of the Piceni, and in the modern Offida in the same region.[1] Another characteristic example is furnished by the name of the Oenotrian Morgetians. According to Antiochus, these occupied, together with the Siculi, the region in Bruttium where Regium arose, even before that city had been founded by the Chalcidians.[2] Since Antiochus of Syracuse affirms that Morges extended the realm of the Oenotrian Morgetians as far as Tarentum, this should be brought into relation with the names found on those high, undulating plateaus which are separated from the Apennines and, running through Apulia, extend as far as the Sallentine plains. Thus the name of *Morgia*, which is found in various points about Mount Garganus—a region which has faithfully preserved such ancient names—has probably come down from the time of the ancient Morgetians. There is probably also an echo of the Oenotrian branch of the Morgetians in the name of the regions termed *le Murgie*, situated in the upper valley of the Sinni (ancient Siris), in the district of Castiglione,

the necessity of providing a toponomatical dictionary for the different nations see the excellent article of C. Jullian in *Beiträge zur alten Geschichte* II (1902) *e*, 1 ff.

[1] The name "Aufidus" seems to mean "the foaming," as does Albinia in Etruria (the modern Albegna).

[2] Antioch. apud Strab. vi, p. 257 C. The Morgetes and Siculi are said to have been driven out ὑπὸ Οἰνωτρῶν, that is, by that portion of the Oenotrians who did not follow Siculus, who had made for himself an ἰδίαν ἀρχήν and had created a division in the ἔθνος (Antioch. apud Dion. Hal. i. 12; cf. *ibid.* 22).

where there also flows a *Rio le Murgie.*[1] Among all of these ancient names which have come down to the present day, the most characteristic are perhaps those of the Osento and Lausento, already noted, since there seems no doubt that they bear the same relation to Ausente that Aufidus does to Oufens and Offida.

It may be worthy of note that a somewhat similar form is found in Etruria—a region which, according to Lycophron, was, in part at least, comprised in the Ausonian territory. I allude to the river Auser which joined the Arnus at Pisa. Moreover, in the central Apennines—a region which from a very early period was inhabited by the Umbrians—there are two short rivers which are still called Ausa. One of these rises in the territory of San Marino, and empties near Rimini into the Adriatic. The other descends from Bertinoro and, joining the Ronco, likewise empties into the Adriatic beyond Forlì.[2] The forms "Auser" and "Ausa" should possibly be compared with that of "Ausente," just as the river Sagrus near the Osento is connected with the ancient Sagras which had its course in Ausonian territory near Locri. It is even possible that another similar parallelism exists between the name of the Umbrian river Metaurus and that of the Ausonian Mataurus which flowed through the territory of the Tauriani in Bruttium between the Casuentus, or Basuentus, near Metapontum (the Κάσα of Bacchylides) and the Casuentini of Tuscan Casentino.

Until the study of Italian toponomical history has made greater

[1] Livy (x. 16) mentions a Morgantia in the southern part of the Samnite territory near Apulia; cf. Steph. Byz., s. v.: Μοργέντιον πόλις Ἰταλίας ἀπὸ Μοργήτων· λέγεται καὶ Μοργεντία. For the region termed *Morgia* in the neighborhood of Garganus see *Carta Stato Magg. Ital.*, sheet 25; for *le Murgie* in the district of Latroncino see sheet 95; for *Rio le Murgie* and the *Regione Murgetta* near Poggio Reale in the district of Castiglione see sheet 21.

[2] In the codices of Plin. *N. H.* iii. 115 one of the two streams near Ariminum is called Aprusa (in cod. *r* is the form *prusa*). Following Cluverius, *Ital. Ant.*, II, ed. 1624, p. 605 (cf. Nissen, *Ital. Landeskunde*, II, 1, p. 248) it is generally admitted that Aprusa corresponds to the modern Ausa. Is it certain, however, that the text of Pliny is exact; and, if it is, would the name of the Ausa near Forli also be derived from a Latin form "Aprusa"? It does not seem so to me. In addition, it should be noted that Ausa is the name of a third stream which flows to the west of Aquileia and empties into the laguna of Marano in the Venetian estuary, between the mouths of the Tagliamento and the Isonzo.

progress it will be impossible to give a definite answer to this and similar questions. Furthermore, the study of toponomy must be closely associated with that of the ancient and mediaeval texts, and with historical literary tradition. Thus, in the case under discussion it would be impossible to attain definite results without seeking, for example, the reasons why Philistus, the Syracusan historian of the fourth century B. C., differing from Antiochus and Hellanicus, should have affirmed that the Siculi were driven from Italy, not by the Oenotrians and Ausonians, but by Siculus, son of Italus, the Ligurian leader, impelled by the Umbrians and Pelasgians.[1] It should be noted, however, that although ancient writers differ regarding the way in which the Ausonians spread, they agree in affirming that they occupied nearly all of the central and southern portion of the peninsula. Moreover, Lycophron, Vergil, and Verrius Flaccus made no mistake in assigning to the Ausonians a greater extent of territory than that which was inhabited by the Auruncians. Vergil was a faithful follower of ancient tradition when he included in Ausonia the plain traversed by the Tiber, and certainly he was repeating these same traditions when he wrote:

> Est locus, Hesperiam Grai cognomine dicunt,
> Terra antiqua, potens armis atque ubere glebae;
> Oenotri coluere viri; nunc fama minores
> Italiam dixisse ducis de nomine gentem.[1]

[1] Philist. apud Dion. Hal. i. 22.

[1] Verg. *Aen.* i. 530 ff.; cf. Dion. Hal. i. 35. Also in the passage (*Aen.* vii. 85) where Vergil speaks of the entire Oenotrian land whence those who went to consult the oracle of Albunea at Tivoli took their departure, he gives Oenotria the same extension as that given Ausonia by Antiochus and Aristotle.

FIG. 1.—Coins of the Auruncians.

II

THE ALLIANCE BETWEEN REGIUM AND TARENTUM AGAINST THE IAPYGIANS

Diodorus places in the fourth year of the seventy-sixth Olympiad (473 B. C.) the war between the Tarentines and the Iapygians which resulted in the well-known defeat of Tarentum. Herodotus does not hesitate to call this the greatest defeat which in his memory ever befell a Greek people.[1] Diodorus tells the story as follows:

In Italy arose a conflict between the Tarentines and the Iapygians concerning their boundaries. For some time they limited themselves to skirmishes, and to laying waste the neighboring country of the enemy. Soon the feeling of hostility increased. Numerous slaughters occurred, and they at last decided upon a pitched battle. The Iapygians drew up the forces they had at their disposal, and added those of their neighboring allies, so that they were finally able to bring together over 20,000 men. The Tarentines, when they heard the strength of the forces collected aganist them, assembled their own city militia, and added that of their ally, Regium. A terrible battle ensued, and many fell on either side, but the Iapygians finally came out victorious. The conquered troops fled in two divisions, of which one retreated toward Tarentum and the other fled toward Regium. The Iapygians followed their example and also separated into two divisions, of which one pursued the Tarentines, there being but a short distance between them [or else between the field of battle and Tarentum], and killed many of their enemy. Those who pursued the other division displayed such valor that they rushed into Regium together with the fugitives and took possession of the city.[2]

The account of Diodorus deserves entire credence in that which refers to the alliance between Tarentum and Regium, and to the great slaughter effected by the Iapygians. It is confirmed by Herodotus, who says that Micythus, ruling in Regium in the name of Anaxilaus (d. 476–75 B. C.), compelled his fellow-citizens to hasten to the aid of Tarentum, and that 3,000 of them perished.[3] Aristotle, too, confirms this narration and speaks of the great number of γνώριμοι Tarentines killed in that defeat, and of the change from an aristocratic to a democratic constitution in Taren-

[1] Herodot. vii. 170. [2] Diod. xi. 52. [3] Herodot. vii. 170.

tum.[1] Moreover, the account of Aelianus concerning the days of fasting which the Regians instituted for the benefit of the besieged Tarentines—an account which I think critics have hitherto overlooked—should be referred to this alliance.[2] Diodorus' narration, however, is utterly absurd when it speaks of the flight of the Regians, and of the pursuit of the Iapygians, who kept so closely behind their enemy that they were enabled to enter Regium with them, and to take possession of the city.

Lorentz, who has done so much for the history of Tarentum, does not think that this account should be doubted;[3] and Doehle merely finds it exaggerated.[4] Grote, however, observes justly that it does not deserve credence, both because Micythus continued to govern Regium till 467,[5] and because Regium was too far from the field of battle. To use his own words, Diodorus "must have had a strange conception of the geography of southern Italy, to speak of a flight from Iapygia to Regium."[6] To the arguments of Grote could be added others, such as the number of Italiot cities in between, the nature of the territory to be traversed, etc. It is useless, however, to stop to refute a statement which at the first glance is seen to be absurd.

Diodorus was evidently wrong, but no one, so far as I know, has sought the origin of his error. It is natural to think that his account is not entirely false. He drew from good sources, and probably often gave passages taken from Timaeus. If the other

[1] Aristot. *Polit.* v. 2. 8.

[2] Aelian. *V. H.* v. 20 says that Ταραντίνων πολιορκουμένων ὑπὸ Ἀθηναίων καὶ μελλόντων ἁλῶναι λιμῷ οἱ Ῥηγῖνοι ἐφηφίσαντο μίαν ἡμέραν ἐν ταῖς δέκα νηστεύειν καὶ ἐκείνης τὰς τροφὰς ἐκχωρῆσαι Ταραντίνοις. I am not certain whether it has already been noted that there is an error in the word Ἀθηναίων, which is present even in the Teubner edition of Hercher. It is impossible to conceive of a siege of Tarentum by the Athenians, especially at the time of their expedition against Sicily. It seems to me that the word should be changed to Μεσσαπίων. It is hardly necessary to recall that the tradition of Antiochus of Syracuse (fr. 15 in Müller, *F. H. G.*, I, p. 184) concerning the origin of Tarentum, as has often been correctly noted, was composed in consequence of the alliance in question.

[3] Lorentz, *De veterum Tarentinorum rebus gestis* (Luccaviae, 1838), p. 8.

[4] Doehle, *Geschichte Tarents* (Strassburg, 1877), pr. p. 14, n. 2.

[5] Grote, *Hist. Greece* (Harper), V, p 238. [6] Cf. Diod. xi. 78. 2.

particulars are true, would it not be just, instead of condemning this part of the narrative, to see if he has not been guilty of one of those inaccuracies which, as everyone knows, occur frequently in his writings? Might it not be that the Regians sought refuge, not in Regium, which is impossible, but in some other and nearer city? And, in that case, what city should we substitute for Regium? I believe that I can solve in substance these problems.

In the first place, let us inquire why Micythus, a politician who is correctly represented as both wise and prudent, should have wished to aid the Tarentines contrary to the desire of his people. The reason which led him to favor an alliance with so distant a city was doubtless the jealousy of Regium toward Syracuse and Hiero. In 476 B. C. the Chalcidian sister-cities, as it were, of Regium—i. e., Naxos, Catana, and Leontini—were subject to Hiero, who had driven out the former inhabitants and established military colonies, substituting Peloponnesan mercenaries for the indigenous populations.[1] The rivals of Syracuse were, on the one hand, Agrigentum, where Theron ruled, and, on the other, Regium, which held the key to the strait, and where Micythus cared so well for the interests of the sons of Anaxilaus and the Regians, that Hiero had to resort to intrigue to get rid of him and take advantage of the inexperience of his own young relatives.[2] Hiero and Syracuse aimed at both political and commercial supremacy. Although Messina was in the power of Regium, Hiero had nevertheless been able to cross the strait. In 474 B. C., one year before the Tarentine war, Hiero had gone to the aid of Cumae and had defeated the Etruscans. The Chalcidian city of Campania had not turned, as one would expect, to her natural ally, her colony of Regium, but to Doric Syracuse.

The dominion of the Regians was therefore shaken to its foundations, and even Regium itself had been menaced by Hiero at the time when Anaxilaus made war on the neighboring Locrians, who were the allies of Syracuse.[3] It was thus natural that Regium procured allies and sought to rival Syracuse, whose victorious ships

[1] Diod. xi. 49. [2] Diod. xi. 66 (467 B. C.); cf. Sch. Pind. *Pyth.* i. 112.

[3] Cf. Sch. Pind. *Pyth.* i. 98.

were pressing to places where the Ionian-Chalcidian and Ionian-Phocaean cities had hitherto exercised an almost uncontested hegemony.

The places from which Regium could hope for aid were Locri, Tarentum, and the Achaean cities. But of these last, Sybaris had been destroyed in 510 B. C., and Metapontum was under the control of Tarentum.[1] There remained Croton, at that time the most important city of the Achaeans. It, too, had been menaced by Hiero some years earlier,[2] and might therefore be thought disposed to aid Regium against Syracuse. It happened, however, that the relations between Croton and Regium were by no means friendly. As early as the battle of the Sagras the Locrians had the Regians as allies against the inhabitants of Croton. Locri had been attacked by Croton on account of the aid given to Ionian Siris. If we find the Regians as allies of the Locrians in the battle of the Sagras, it may be supposed that they—practically Ionians as they were—had also aided Siris, which was likewise a commercial rival of Croton. That Regium was not on friendly terms with Croton about 473 B. C. is shown by the circumstance that she received the Pythagoreans who fled from Croton shortly after that year.[3] And, finally, Regium could not hope for aid from the Locrians, who at

[1] It seems to me evident from all that we know of the history of Metapontum, that she was under the hegemony of Tarentum, and that she had lost the right of following an independent policy, even though retaining her autonomous form of government. For example, the Tarentines in the struggle against Thurii in 433 B. C. two years after the foundation of that city, seized Siris and founded in its place the city of Heraclea (Diod. xii. 36). Since in this war there is no mention of Metapontum, and it is stated that at a later period the Tarentines held at Heraclea the council of the Italic league (see Strab. vi p. 280 C), it is clear that Metapontum had no direct voice in the assemblage, as did Tarentum, the mistress of the Achaean territory. For the same reason, when (about 453 ?) the Achaean League was revived (see Polyb. ii. 39), among the cities taking part were Croton, Caulonia, and the second Sybaris; but there is no mention of Metapontum, which, although preserving local autonomy and coinage, had become in its external policy a simple dependency of Tarentum. This fact was not understood by Holländer in his otherwise excellent work (*De rebus Metapontinorum* [Gottingae, 1851], p. 34), where he supposes that Metapontum was a member of the league of which Polybius speaks, and wonders why Metapontum is not mentioned in connection with the struggle between Tarentum and Thurii.

[2] See below. [3] See Aristot., fr. 11, in Müller, *F. H. G.*, II, p. 274.

that time must have been the most hostile of all. Common peril had united their forces at the Sagras, but when this was over the ancient enmity again made its appearance—an enmity due to difference of race, to the rivalry caused by their proximity, and to the fact that Locri had possession of Mesma and Hipponium, and through these (as Croton, Siris, and Sybaris had done) not only had injured and continued to injure the commerce of Regium,[1] but also had prevented her territorial expansion in Bruttium. Regium, then, was hostile to Locri about 473, and Locri, situated between the hostile cities of Regium and Croton, found safety in relying upon Syracuse, which from this time on remained her faithful ally.

Only Tarentum remained, but her friendship was precious. She possessed the only ample and safe harbor between the Cape of Leucas and the Strait of Messina, and the only good winter station. Moreover, every ship which went from Italy to Greece, or came from the East to the West, had to touch at her port.[2]

Tarentum, it is true, was a Doric city, and thus should have been the natural ally of Syracuse; but in all ages blood-affinity has yielded to commercial interests. The prosperity of Syracuse at the time of the Deinomenids could not help awakening the jealousy of the Spartan city, and calling forth the hostile feelings which Tarentum held toward Syracuse at the time of the great Dionysius.[3]

Regium was mistress of the strait, and Tarentum possessed the port nearest to both Greece and the East.[4] An agreement between them was not only injurious to the commercial interests of all the other Italiot cities, but was destined to check Syracuse, which was

[1] To understand the commercial loss which the possession of Hipponium by Locri caused Regium, it is enough to recall that Hipponium was one of the best places for catching the tunny-fish. Indeed, according to the judgment of Archestratus, the famous Sicilian epicure (apud Athen. vii, p. 302 C.), the tunny-fish of Hipponium were the best in the world.

[2] Polyb. x. 1.

[3] The true feelings of the Tarentines toward Syracuse at the time of Dionysius are clearly shown by Polyaenus (v. 8. 2), and their hatred of their powerful rival at the time of Agathocles is well known. So far as we know, the cities were friendly only at the time of the Syracusan democracy, at the arrival of the Athenians, and at the time of Dionysius II.

[4] Polyb. x. 1

spreading out, and at that time was penetrating boldly into the Tyrrhenian Sea, where, as we have already seen, the Chalcidian cities, foremost among which were Regium and Cumae, had long exercised an important control. It was because Micythus wished to rival Syracuse that in the second year of the seventy-seventh Olympiad (471 B. C.) he founded a Regine colony at Pyxus or Buxentum (Policastro) on the Tyrrhenian coast.[1] It is this colony which gives the key to the alliance between Tarentum and Regium, and also to the disputed passage in question. Diodorus says that Micythus ἔκτισε Πυξοῦντα; and he is right if he means that Micythus founded there a Regine colony, but wrong if he means that Buxentum was then founded for the first time. A silver incuse stater of the middle of the sixth century shows that Pyxus stood in relations of alliance and friendship with Siris, the Ionian city founded by Colophon, and situated on the banks of the river of the same name on the Tarentine Gulf.[2]

Both Regium and Tarentum had to compete with Sybaris, whose inhabitants were enabled, by ascending the valley of the Coscile, to transport the wares of Miletus to the two colonies of Laos and Scidrus on the Tyrrhenian coast. By the same channel, too, the wares of Etruria came down to Sybaris and were there placed on ships bound for the East.[3] In addition, the Sybarites competed with the inhabitants of Croton, who for the same purpose had early seized upon Terina and Tempsa on the Tyrrhenian side.

We know that about the middle of the sixth century the three Achaean cities, Metapontum, Sybaris, and Croton, made war upon and destroyed Ionian Siris.[4] There is no doubt about the cause which led the Achaeans to subjugate Siris; it was commercial

[1] Diod. xi. 59.

[2] Head, *Hist. num.*, p. 69; Garrucci, *Le monete dell' Italia antica*, II, p. 145, Plate 108, numbers 1, 3. On one side of the stater (℞) we read Σιρῖνος; on the other, Πυξόες. The meaning of this coin was also noticed by Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.*, I, p. 263; II, p. 229.

[3] Lenormant, *La grande Grêce*, I, p. 263 ff.; Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.*, I, p. 256.

[4] For the date of this battle see Busolt, *op. cit.*, II, p. 229, n. 4; cf., Grosser, *Gesch. u. Alterthümer d. Stadt Croton* (Minden, 1866), I, pp. 22 ff.—a careful work, but without political insight, and not free from grave errors.

rivalry pure and simple. To its aid came Locri and possibly Regium. Certainly both of these cities had been attacked by Croton after the destruction of Siris, in favor of which city it is possible that Ionic Chalcidian Regium discriminated against Achaean Sybaris, Croton, and Metapontum.[1]

If the above facts are considered in connection with the league between Regium and Tarentum in 473, and with the foundation of Pyxus in 471, it is evident that Micythus was endeavoring, together with Tarentum, to compete with—or, better yet, to oppose a barrier to—Syracuse, and possibly in part also to Agrigentum, since at that time both cities were aiming to supplant the other Italiot and Siceliot cities in all international commercial relations.[2] Herodotus expressly states that Micythus compelled his fellow-citizens to offer aid to the Tarentines. This is easily understood. Not only was Tarentum a Doric city, while the greater portion of the Regians were Ionic (which counts for much or little according to the interests involved), but it seemed, as it really was, very far away, and to have no direct relations with Regium. But Micythus was much more far-sighted than the Regians. The alliance with Tarentum seemed to him the best means of guaranteeing to Regium, and to the other Chalcidian colonies of Campania, a direct trade-route between the East and the West. Since the strait was but nominally in the hands of Regium, it was necessary to resort to strategy. The wares which came to Tarentum were disem-

[1] It is well to note that here and elsewhere, to the confusion of some later writers, Grosser (*op. cit.*, p. 19) has used apocryphal material, asserting, e. g., that there exists a coin of the alliance between Croton and Siris, from which he concludes that Siris fell into the power of Croton. Much less could this conclusion be drawn from Lycophron (vss. 983 ff.), or rather from his scholiast, since there the only allusion is to the war waged against Siris by Croton, Sybaris, and Metapontum; cf. Iust. xx. 2. 4 ff.

[2] Rathgeber, *Grossgriechenl. u. Pythag.* (Gotha, 1866), pp. 188 ff., has misunderstood the meaning of the Regine colony of Pyxus, which he thinks was founded to hold in check the ambitions of Croton and the piracy of the Etruscans. It is probable that the inhabitants of Croton were enemies of the Regians, but they were also enemies of Hiero and Syracuse about 476 B. C. (cf. Diod. xi. 48; Sch. Pind. *Ol.* ii. 29). Moreover, the Etruscans had been severely defeated in 474, and in 471 were certainly in no condition to molest the Siceliots. Of their later incursions the only mention is in 453 B. C. (cf. Diod. xi. 88).

barked at the mouth of the Siris (today the Sinni) and carried up its valley to within a short distance of the opposite coast where Pyxus was located. Thus a rather long voyage along the shores of the Ionian and Tyrrhenian Seas was spared; the passage through the Strait of Messina was avoided; and the wares, after but a brief journey and with no danger of being intercepted by hostile ships, were brought to within a short distance of Cumae, Naples, and the other Chalcidian colonies of Campania. Reasons similar to those which determined the alliance between Tarentum and Regium certainly maintained the good relations between Naples and Tarentum up to the fourth century B. C.[1]

At first sight it would seem that Regium derived the greater advantage from the alliance. However, the excellence of her harbor assured Tarentum the passage of all the wares which came from the East to the West, or vice versa. She feared no competition, and it was she who favored Regium by giving her the preference in commercial relations. On the other hand, Tarentum was jealous of Syracuse. Moreover, while Regium was securely situated, remote from the barbarian invasions—the Samnite tribes had not yet made their entrance into Bruttium—Tarentum was continually menaced by her fierce neighbors, the Iapygian Messapians, and by the invading Samnite tribes.[2] Regium was at that time at the head of an extensive confederacy of Ionian-Chalcidian cities, and was populous and flourishing.[3] It was natural that Tarentum, as an equivalent, should ask from her armed assistance in case of war. In addition, Regium was indirectly menaced by the same peril. It was no mere coincidence that in 474 B. C. Cumae was attacked by the Etruscans, and that in 473 Tarentum had to contend with the Iapygians. An assault had been made upon Cumae in 524, not only by Etruscans, but also by Umbrians and Daunians; and at about the same time the Tarentines were attacked by the Messapians.[4]

[1] Dion. Hal. xv. 5; Liv. viii. 27.

[2] See below.

[3] Strab. vi, p. 258 C. states that *ἴσχυσε δὲ μέγιστον ἡ τῶν Ῥηγίνων πόλις καὶ περιοικίδας ἔσχε συχνάς.* Its power was at its height at the time of Anaxilaus and Dionysius I.

[4] For the assault on Cumae in 524 B. C. see Dion. Hal. vii. 3. It is not possible

The Iapygians and Messapians were not the only ones to attack Tarentum. In the fifth century they were joined by the Peucetians.[1] It is fair to suppose that the great defeat which befell the Tarentines about 473 was due, as we may derive from Herodotus, rather to fresh invasions of peoples of Samnite descent, than to the valor of the Messapian Iapygians.[2]

At the beginning of the fifth century the Chalcidian cities—that is to say, the allied sister-cities of Regium—and Tarentum as well, were menaced by the same enemy. There was therefore another motive, besides those just mentioned, for the two widely separated Italiot cities to unite in their struggle against Hiero and the invading barbarians. For similar reasons the Italiot cities later united against the league of the Lucanians and Dionysius.

From the above it is evident why the Regians, after their defeat at the hands of the Iapygians, fled toward some city which was not Tarentum, and was situated at some distance from it. They did

to determine the date when the Tarentines won the victory over the Messapians and dedicated at Delphi the statue by Ageladas (cf. Paus. x. 10. 6). Lorentz (*op. cit.*, pp. 4 ff.) places it in the seventy-eighth Olympiad=468 B. C., but furnishes no special proof. A still somewhat uncertain element which escaped Lorentz, but which better establishes the date of the war, is that Ageladas made the statue of the Anochus of Tarentum (Paus. vi. 14. 11) who was victorius in the sixty-fifth Olympiad, or 520 B. C. (see Eus., ed. Schöne, *ad loc.*). It may be, however, that Ageladas received this order from the Tarentine Anochus some time before he worked for his own city.

[1] Unfortunately it is impossible to determine in what year the Tarentines defeated the united Iapygians and Peucetians. The gifts which they sent to Delphi on account of this victory were made by Onatas of Aegina (Paus. x. 13. 10). From Paus. vi. 12. 1; viii. 42. 8, we learn that Onatas worked for Hiero, whose gifts were sent to Olympia after his death (476 B. C.). On the strength of this, Lorentz (*op. cit.*, p. 6) places the victory over the Iapygians and Peucetians in Ol. 80=460 B. C. He is followed by Döhle (*op. cit.*, p. 27), who, without stating why, places the date between Ol. 78 and Ol. 80=468–460 B. C. Although uncertain, this date has an approximate value; cf. the statements of Paus. viii. 42. 7 concerning the period of Onatas.

[2] I think this observation weakens the argument of Helbig (*Hermes*, XI [1876], p. 265), who takes for his basis the account of Herodotus and the youthful vigor of the Iapygians, and derives data for the period in which this people arrived in Apulia. I shall elsewhere demonstrate that the Peucetians were really a branch of the great Sabine parent-tribe, to which belonged the Piceni of Picenum and the Picentini on the confines of Campania.

not seek refuge in an allied city, but in a possession of their own, since in the region toward the Ionian Sea they must have owned either a city or a fortress.

That the Tarentines had granted the Regians the full possession of the fortress which rose on the site of ancient Siris is improbable. It is more natural to suppose that the Tarentines, who during all their political existence had struggled for the possession of the Siritis, and who had fought for it first with Metapontum (which at this period probably recognized their sovereignty), and later with Thurii, would not brook the superiority of Regium on those shores. Since, however, Regium was mistress of Pyxus, and carried on commerce with the Tarentines through the valley of the Siris, it seems reasonable to suppose that they owned a factory at the mouth of that river.

Still another possibility suggests itself. It is known that Oenotria and Chonia had become hellenized before the time of the Samnite invasions.[1] The valley of the Siris had been in the possession of the Greeks at least from the sixth century. Is it not probable that Regium owned a fortress at that point in the valley which marked her own confines, or rather those of her colony, Pyxus? The passage in Aelianus (derived, as usual, from good sources) concerning the fasting of the Regians to aid Tarentum confirms this supposition. It is absurd to suppose that the fast occurred at Regium, but most reasonable to believe that those fasting were the soldiers and inhabitants of the city in the valley of the Siris. In that case it would be toward this fortress that the Regians turned their steps after their defeat.

At any rate, we have at least made it probable that the place captured by the Iapygians was along the course of the Siris, although it would be useless to attempt to determine more nearly the exact situation of the city or fortress.[2] It may be noted merely that the facility with which the Iapygians mingled with the fugitives and seized their place of refuge tends rather to show that they

[1] Grote rightly insists on this idea (*op. cit.*, III, p. 393).

[2] It would also be useless, having only the data from Diodorus and Herodotus, to attempt to determine where the battle occurred. All that is certain is that it was not far from Tarentum.

did not conquer a city properly speaking, but rather a fortress which was either badly or scantily defended, or else utterly destitute of defenders.

Diodorus, however, must have drawn carelessly from his source (probably Timaeus), and have transformed the fortress of the Regians into the city of Regium itself. The error, nevertheless, has its useful side. It could have come only from a writer of the stamp of Diodorus, who unfortunately both here and elsewhere gives evidence of a lack of diligence, and of that which is worse than ignorance—a lack of understanding.

To weaken the value of these statements it may be objected that, while the battle with the Iapygians is assigned by Diodorus to 473 B. C., the same author says that Pyxus was founded in 471. There is no use, however, of wasting words to show the worthlessness of such an objection. It has often been observed, and is now a well-known fact, that Diodorus embraces under a single heading the events of various years. The very chapter which describes the battle is one of many cases which may be quoted to prove this assertion. Whoever reads this attentively will find that Diodorus places in 473 the beginning of the war between the Tarentines and Iapygians, and says that the skirmishes lasted *ἐπὶ μέν τινας χρόνους* before they came to pitched battle. Even a superficial reading of the text brings out the fact that all of this could not have taken place in 473, as even the more careful modern scholars are accustomed to state. The date of the Regine colony of Pyxus (471 B. C.) gives us approximately a *terminus ad quem* for the battle itself. There seems to me no doubt that Regium must have been mistress of that city at the time when she sent over 3,000 of her own citizens to the aid of Tarentum.

Strabo, who also mentions the founding of Pyxus by Micythus, adds that *πάλιν δ' ἀπῆραν οἱ ἱδρυσθέντες πλὴν ὀλίγων.*[1] This also is clear. As a result of the intrigues of Hiero, four years after having founded Pyxus, Micythus left Regium and went to live at Tegea in Arcadia.[2] With his departure disappeared the last rival

[1] Strab. vi, p. 252 C.

[2] Herodot. vii. 170; Diod. xi. 66; Paus. v. 26. 4.

of Hiero, for Theron died in 472, and his son Thrasidaeus was afterward conquered at the Himera. Syracuse could now domineer in the Tyrrhenian Sea as well.[1] In 467, however, Hiero himself died, and with him perished the glory and power of the Deinomenids, and the might of the proud Corinthian colony suffered a temporary eclipse.

[1] Rathgeber's observations (*op. cit.*, p. 189) to the effect that the Regine colony of Pyxus became less important on account of the rivalry between Croton and Terina, have neither foundation nor value.

III

THE LEGEND OF EUTHYMUS OF LOCRI

Pausanias, in speaking of the statues dedicated at Olympia to victorious athletes, mentions among others that of Euthymus of Locri, the work of Pythagoras of Regium, and takes occasion to introduce a legend which is also referred to by Aelianus and Suidas, and which, in brief, is as follows: Ulysses in his wanderings touched at Temesa, where one of his companions, having violated a virgin, was stoned to death by the natives. Shortly afterward, the *δαίμων* of the man began to take such savage vengeance on the inhabitants of Temesa that they even planned to leave Italy. An answer from the Pythian Apollo, however, induced them to remain, and to placate the hero with a temple and with the annual sacrifice of one of the most beautiful of the virgins. Euthymus of Locri, son of the river Caecinus which separates the Regine from the Locrian territory, on his return from his victory in boxing at Olympia, arrived at Temesa at the moment when the hero was being offered his usual victim. He obtained permission to enter the temple, and at sight of the maiden his pity was changed to love. He therefore decided to conquer the hero and marry the maiden. Arming himself, he firmly awaited the hero, and forced him to leave the land and throw himself into the sea. After this feat Euthymus celebrated a splendid wedding. This much Pausanias says he had from hearsay (*ἤκουσα*), and then he adds:

> I remember that I once came upon a picture which was a copy of an old painting. It was like this: There was a youth [i. e., Euthymus], Sybaris, and a river Calabrus, and a spring Lyca, and near a hero's shrine the city of Temesa; and there, too, was the ghost which Euthymus expelled. The ghost was of a horrid black color. His whole appearance was most dreadful, and he wore a wolfskin. On the picture was also written the name of Alybas.[1]

[1] Paus. vi. 6. 4 ff.; cf. Suid. ad v. *Εὔθυμος*, who abridges either Pausanias or their common source, and who more correctly calls the ghost *Ἀλύβας*, which in the codices of Pausanias is certainly erroneously termed Lycas or Lybas; cf. Ael. *V. H.* viii. 18; Prov. Alex. 131.

The character of Euthymus, although involved in legend, is certainly historical, as is also the fact that a statue was erected to him by Pythagoras of Regium.[1] And that even in the account of his struggle with the hero of Temesa there is involved some truth, is shown by a passage in Strabo, who, in speaking of Temesa, says:

> Near Temesa, surrounded by a grove of wild olives, is the heroon of Polites, one of the companions of Ulysses, who was betrayed and killed by the barbarians, and became so desirous of vengeance that those who inhabited the region were compelled to pay him tribute, in response to an oracle, and gave rise to the proverb which is used when speaking of an unmerciful man: "The hero of Temesa is in him." When the Epizephyrian Locrians captured the city, it is said that Euthymus the boxer contended with the hero and, having conquered him, forced him to return the tribute to the inhabitants.[2]

The account of Pausanias agrees with that of Strabo, and is probably derived from the same source. The passage from Strabo has the additional advantage of showing that we have to deal with more than a myth pure and simple, and that the account involves one absolutely historical fact, namely, the conquest of Temesa by the Locrians, who were probably captained by the boxer Euthymus, just as the inhabitants of Croton had been by the athlete Milo in the struggle against Sybaris. It is also probable that the tribute which Euthymus wished restored was a real tribute which Temesa had been paying to Croton. From about the middle of the sixth century Croton had been either the ally of Temesa or else her mistress. As I shall have occasion to repeat, Temesa was not in origin an Achaean city, but was regarded as a colony either of the Aetolians or of the Phocians.[3]

[1] The base of the statue of Euthymus, inscribed as the work of Pythagoras (here termed a Samian), was found in the excavations at Olympia; cf. Roehl, *Inscr. gr. ant.*, no. 388, and Loewy, *Inschr. gr. Bildhauer* (Leipzig, 1885), pp. 19 ff.

[2] Strab. vi, p. 255 C.; cf. Ael. *loc cit.* A partial comparison between the two passages was made by Marincola-Pistoia, *Opuscoli di storia patria* (Cantanzaro, 1871), p. 105, the first among Calabrian scholars to recognize the importance of the account for the history of Temesa.

[3] Temesa was a colony of the Aetolians led by Thoas, according to the source of Strab. vi, p. 255 C.; or of Phocians led by Schedius and Epistrophus, grandsons of the Phocian Naubolus, and coming from the Crissaean Gulf, according to that of Lycophron, vss. 1067 ff. The legend of Thoas seems of Achaean origin and is derived from the domination of Croton over the city. Thoas was a hero of the

Let us now see with what other events the conquest of Temesa on the part of the Locrians is connected, and at what period this conquest occurred. So far as I know, no one has as yet attempted such an investigation.

Pausanias, after stating that Euthymus was declared victor in the boxing contests in the seventy-fourth, seventy-sixth, and seventy-seventh Olympiads—i. e., in the years 484, 476, and 472 B. C.—goes on to say that on his return to Italy he contended against the hero.[1] That Euthymus really won three times at Olympia, as Pausanias asserts, is confirmed by the inscription to which we have just referred.[2] According to Suidas,[3] however, the three victories occurred after the defeat of Euthymus at the hands of the Thasian Theagenes, who conquered in the seventy-fifth Olympiad,[4] or in 480 B. C., and therefore in the seventy-sixth, seventy-seventh, and seventy-eighth Olympiads, or in 476, 472, and 468 B. C. A comparison between the texts of Pausanias and Suidas, however, makes it probable that Suidas erred in deriving his information, whether his authority was Pausanias, whom he often seems to copy directly, or a common source. Following the words of Pausanias, it would seem at first glance that Euthymus arrived at Locri after 472. If, however, we examine this passage more closely, it will be found necessary to modify this opinion, as it is hardly possible that Euthymus remained at Olympia between the years 484 and 472. In all probability he returned home after each of his three victories. The expression *ἐπανήκων* is vague and general, and might refer to either 484, 476, or 472 B. C. But, although vague, the passage from Pausanias is precious, since from it we learn that Euthymus conquered Temesa at the time when the Deinomenids were ruling at Syracuse. Gelo was in power between 484 and 478, and his brother Hiero died in 467 B. C. It is the study of the Italiot policy of these rulers, and of their actions in

Peloponnesan Achaeans (see Paus. v. 25. 8 ff.; and cf. Hom. *Il.* vii. 168). It should be remembered that the Opuntian Locrians were ashamed of their origin and were accustomed to call themselves Aetolians (cf. Paus. x. 38. 4).

[1] Paus. vi. 6. 7.

[2] Roehl, *op. cit.*, no. 388: *Εὔθυμος Λοκρὸς Ἀστυκλέος τρὶς Ὀλύμπι' ἐνίκων.*

[3] Ad v. *Εὔθυμος.*

[4] Paus. vi. 6. 5.

regard to Locri, which will make us fully understand the meaning of the capture of Temesa by the Locrians.

Up to the preceding century Temesa had been either a colony or an ally of Croton. This is shown by the silver staters bearing the names of the two cities. These staters endured as late as the beginning of the following century.[1] The attack of Locri was in reality directed against Croton. Since the middle of the preceding century the inhabitants of Croton had in vain tried to subjugate the Locrians, who in their city beside the Sagras had ably succeeded in defending their liberty. In the battle of the Sagras, however, they had the Regians as allies, and now these also had become their fierce enemies. Between 478 and 476 Anaxilaus, the powerful ruler of Regium, was at war with the Locrians, and only the intervention of Hiero compelled him to respect the allies of Syracuse.[2] In 476 Croton made war upon the Sybarites, who likewise were saved from ruin by the intervention of Hiero.[3]

It seems to me that there is no need of any great amount of political insight to establish, by means of these apparently isolated and fragmentary passages, which are in reality closely connected, the fact that the inhabitants of Regium and Croton were the common enemies of the Locrians, and that their taking of Temesa was merely an episode in these events.

Through Herodotus[4] we know that the Carthaginians were led to assail Theron of Agrigentum by Anaxilaus of Regium, father-in-law of Terillus, whom Theron had driven from Himera. The battle of Himera (480 B. C.) brought to naught the designs of Anaxilaus, and confirmed the power of Theron, and also that of Gelo of Syracuse. It was natural that Gelo should now make Anaxilaus pay dearly for bringing the Carthaginians into Siceliot affairs, even to the extent of making him give up his own children as hostages. And, although it is said that Gelo was generous toward him,[5] it

[1] Head, *op. cit.*, pp. 80, 96.

[2] See Sch. Pind. *Pyth.* i. 89; ii. 34. Hiero mounted the throne in 478 (Diod. xi. 38); Anaxilaus died in 476 (Diod. xi. 48).

[3] Diod. xi. 48; Sch. Pind. *Ol.* ii. 29.

[4] Herod. vii. 165.

[5] At least Diodorus (xi. 66) makes Hiero say this to the sons of Anaxilaus. This

is nevertheless evident that he wished to derive benefit from the victory, and in his turn mingle in the affairs of Italy.

Duris of Samos, the historian of Agathocles, relates that near Hipponium was a sacred grove, in which was an edifice erected by Gelo, entitled the "Horn of Amalthea."[1] From this passage we are certainly not authorized to deduce that Hipponium fell under the domination of the Deinomenids.[2] We may, however, conclude from it that Gelo, when he benefited Hipponium, the colony of Locri, initiated that Italiot policy which was continued by his brother Hiero when he interfered in favor of Locri, and which was closely copied by Dionysius I when he made Locri a stepping-stone toward his domination of the Italiot cities. We know that Dionysius rewarded Locri for her loyalty by giving her the territory of the various colonies of Croton—i. e., Caulonia, Scylacium, and possibly, as we have elsewhere noted, that of Terina. Hence, when at the time of the Deinomenids we see the Locrians assail and take possession of Temesa, which was likewise a colony or an ally of Croton, it is evident that in this also they were supported by Syracuse. Thanks to their alliance with her, they were enabled to accomplish similar results against like enemies both in the fifth and in the succeeding century.

A confirmation of the above is given by another passage from Pausanias, who says that Astylus of Croton was thrice declared victor in the stadium at Olympia, but that the second and third times, as a favor to Hiero, he had himself proclaimed, not from Croton, but from Syracuse. Pausanias adds that on account of this the inhabitants of Croton regarded the house of Astylus as infamous and used it as a prison, and that they threw to the ground his statue, the work of Pythagoras of Regium, which he had dedicated in the temple of Lacinian Hera.[3] Astylus conquered in the

would also prove the strict bonds of relationship existing between Hiero and Anaxilaus.

[1] Duris apud Athen. xii, p. 512 A. = M. *F. H. G*, III, p. 479, no. 441.

[2] It seems to me that Holm (*Gesch. Sic.*, I, p. 211) exaggerates when he says in this connection: "Wir haben sogar Spuren, dass Gelon ausser dem grössten Theile Siciliens auch einen Theil von Italien beherrschte."

[3] Paus. vii. 13. 1. One of the victories of Astylus was sung by Simonides (see Bergk, *Poet. lyr. Grec.*, III[4], p. 391, fr. no. 10).

seventy-third, seventy-fourth, and seventy-fifth Olympiads, corresponding to the years 488, 484, and 480 B. C.[1] It seems to me, however, that before 480 the inhabitants of Croton could not have been hostile toward Syracuse, for otherwise they would not have allowed Astylus to place in the temple of Hera the statue which had been made by Pythagoras of Regium; and it also seems to me that any resolutions detrimental to Astylus, who had declared himself a Syracusan in 484, must have been taken after 480, the year of his third victory, and also the year of the battle of Himera, since it was after that battle that the Syracusans interfered directly as masters of the affairs of Italy.

It was with reason that Croton bore such hatred toward Syracuse, since the aid given the Locrians, as also the loss of Temesa, was for her an inestimable injury. Temesa was so situated that Croton could compete successfully along commercial lines with the Chalcidian cities controlling the Strait of Messina. To lose her meant no longer to have free access to the Tyrrhenian coast. Subsequent to the period of which we are speaking we have no more coins of Temesa. On the other hand, it was not till about 480 that the coins of Terina appeared. Thus the numismatical data are in perfect harmony with the literary.

About the middle of the fourth century Temesa was in the power of the Brettians, from whom she was taken by Hannibal. She continued to exist as a Roman colony, and Pausanias—provided, of course, that he is really giving personal information, and not reproducing exactly his ancient source—asserts that she was still inhabited in his time.[2] That after 480 she ceased to coin money is evidently due to the fact that she then came into the power of the Locrians, who coined money neither in their own city nor in their colonies of Mesma and Hipponium. There are no coins from these cities before the middle of the fourth century.[3]

In all probability the inhabitants of Croton sought by the founding of Terina to remedy the loss they had suffered. The new city,

[1] See Eus., ed. Schöne, I, p. 203. [2] See Strab. vi, p. 255 C.; Paus. *loc. cit.*

[3] An analogous phenomenon is presented by Sparta, which did not commence to coin money till about the end of the fourth century, under King Areus (see Head, *op. cit.*, pp. 363 ff.).

which dominated the isthmus between the gulfs of Hipponium and Scylacium, and which protected the road leading to the Ionian Sea and to Croton, was a point of offense toward the valley of the Lameto, which certainly in the course of time also fell into the hands of Croton. It is likewise probable that Temesa again became a possession of the Achaean cities at the time when, with Hiero and Thrasybulus, the power of the Deinomenids, as also that of Locri, disappeared. Thus we understand why Temesa, although no longer in the hands of Locri, coined no more money; for by that time Terina had become mistress of the valley of the Lameto, and would not tolerate an autonomous and rival city in such close proximity.

We have seen that at about the same period, and possibly in the same year, in which Hiero intervened in favor of the Locrians, he also aided the Sybarites, who were threatened by Croton. The inhabitants of Croton were the common enemies of both of these cities, and we may suppose that the Locrians were at that period friends of the Sybarites, who were living in their colonies of Laos and Scidrus,[1] and possibly also at Posidonia.

A possible confirmation of this supposition may be found in the legend of Euthymus. Pausanias, as we have seen, describes a painting in which appeared all of the characters and elements represented in the legend; i. e., Temesa, the temple of the hero, the δαίμων, the spring Lyca, the river Calabrus, the νεανίσκος, or Euthymus, and Σύβαρις. It seems to me that Sybaris can here be nothing else than the name of the liberated maiden.

It has already been noted that the legend of Euthymus and his struggle against the δαίμων sets forth in poetical form a historical fact, and relates to the conquest of Temesa by the Locrians led by Euthymus. We have also considered it probable that the tribute which the ghost demanded, and which Euthymus returned, indicates a real tribute imposed upon the city of Croton.

Is it not also more natural, instead of believing that a marriage occurred between Euthymus and the liberated maiden, to think that also the name of this maiden, this Σύβαρις, is mythical? To

[1] Herodot. vi. 21.

understand the true import of this question it is necessary to refer to an analogous legend, preserved by Antoninus Liberalis, and taken by him from Nicander, who possibly heard it in the country of its origin.

Near Parnassus and Crissa, says Nicander, was a cave in Mount Cirphis, in which lived a monster, called Lamia or Sybaris, that seized and devoured both cattle and men. The Delphians were already considering a change of location, and consulted the god, who ordered them to place in the cave the child of one of the citizens. The lot fell upon Alcyone, who with wreathed head was conducted to the cave of Sybaris. However, Eurybatus, son of Euphemus, who derived his origin from the river Axius, impelled by some δαίμων, met the young victim, fell in love, and, after removing the wreath from her head, asked to be conducted in her stead to the cave. He there seized Sybaris, drew him forth into the light, and threw him down from the rocks. The head of the monster struck against a rock, from which gushed forth a spring, which too was termed Sybaris. From this, concludes Nicander, the Locrians who founded the city of Sybaris in Italy drew their name.[1]

The points of contact between the two legends are very evident. Suffice it to notice that in the same way that Eurybatus, although son of Euphemus, takes his origin from the river Axius, so the Locrian Euthymus, although son of Astycles, was reputed the son of the river Caecinus.[2] The finding of the same legend at Temesa and in Locris need cause no surprise. Parnassus stands between the land of the Phocians and that of the Ozolian Locrians, of whom the Epizephyrian Locrians in Italy were a colony.[3]

[1] Ant. Lib. viii. [2] See Roehl, *op. cit.*, no. 388; cf. Paus., *loc. cit.*

[3] Whether the Epizephyrian Locrians were by origin Opuntians or Ozolians was the occasion of controversy even in antiquity. Strab. vi, p. 259 C., or rather his source, opposed Ephorus, who thought they came from Opuntia (cf. Pseud.-Scymn., vss. 316 ff.). I do not know whether it has previously been noted that the passage in Paus. vi. 19. 6 shows that they were, for the most part at least, Ozolians. In this passage he says that in the treasury of the Sicyonians at Olympia there was an ἄγαλμα πύξινον Ἀπόλλωνος ἐπιχρύσον τὴν κεφαλήν, which had been dedicated by the Locrians of Italy, and was the work of Patrocles of Croton. Although this Patrocles is unknown and his date uncertain, nevertheless from the nature of the

Temesa itself is said to have been colonized in ancient times by the Phocians of Phocis. It is therefore natural that in the countries inhabited by the same people should be found this Greek myth, which reappears also in the legend of Perseus and Andromeda. We are struck, nevertheless, by the similarity between the name of the monster Sybaris and that of the Achaean city, and especially by the statement of Antoninus Liberalis to the effect that this gave origin to the founding of Locrian Sybaris in Italy. It is also to be noted that Solinus,[1] in speaking of the founding of Greek colonies in Italy, in a passage where he mentions various traditions which were derived from good sources, and of which some are also preserved by other writers worthy of credence, asserts that Sybaris was founded "a Troezeniis et a Sagari Aiacis Locrii filii."

Is it true that Locrians had a share in the founding of Sybaris? I see no reason for doubting such an assertion. Aristotle[2] says that Troezenians took part in its foundation.[3] If Solon, or his source, agrees with the great philosopher in this, why should we think him in error in saying that Locrians as well came to Sybaris? His statement is confirmed by the passage just quoted from Nicander, a writer who is fairly well informed concerning the peoples of northern Greece. It is not strange that the Achaeans who founded Sybaris should have summoned to take part in their colony the Ozolian Locrians who dwelt along the shores of the Corinthian Gulf, and who were directly opposite the metropolis of Sybaris, Helica, and separated from it merely by a narrow arm of the gulf. It is a characteristic of all Greek colonies, and indeed of most colonies past and present, that they are made up of mixed elements.[4]

If it is true that there was a Locrian contingent in the population of Sybaris, we understand better how the Locrians and the Syba-

image we may conclude that it was archaic, and the friendship of the Epizephyrian Locrians for the Sicyonians finds a plausible explanation in the relations which must have existed between the two peoples inhabiting the opposite shores of the Corinthian Gulf.

[1] Solin. ii. 10, ed. Mommsen. [2] Aristot. *Polit.* v. 3. [3] See below.

[4] It is worthy of note that Lycophron (vss. 1075 ff.), when speaking of Temesa and the Phocian colony of the Naubolides, refers to the legend of the Trojan Setaia who perished at Sybaris.

rites could have been united about 476 B.C. To the political reasons of the time would be added those determined by tradition and by affinity. Probably no small part of the strengthening of the mutual bonds was played by the laws of the Locrian Zaleucus. These laws were also in force in Achaean Sybaris at an early period.[1]

We are far from asserting positively that the tradition is true. It could, for example, have had its origin in later political events. It may be that the alliance of 476 between the Sybarites and the Locrians gave rise to the tradition that Tarentum was founded by those citizens who did not wish to take part in the expedition against the Messanians.

However one decides in regard to this intricate question, one thing I hold to be most probable, namely, that the name of Sybaris on the painting seen by Pausanias refers to the bonds of alliance which existed between Locri and Sybaris about 476 B. C.[2]

The legends of Euthymus and Eurybatus are worthy of study in other respects also. It is interesting, for example, to note how a legend which was of either Phocian or Locrian origin, and which was localized in Magna Graecia, should have become fused with the myth referring to the adventures of Ulysses, and how a historical fact should finally have become adorned and clothed with the combined features of the two myths. Euthymus, a perfectly historical character, is no longer considered the son of Astycles, but becomes the son of the river which divides the territory of the Locrians from that of the neighboring Regians. He is not over-

[1] Pseud.-Scymn., vss. 246 f.

[2] Paus. vi. 19. 9 says that according to some authors the ancient name of Lupiae (Lecce) was Sybaris. Keeping in mind a passage from Hyginus (apud Serv. ad *Aen.* iii. 553: "Aulon mons est Calabriae in quo oppidum fuit a Locris conditum;" cf. Hor. *Carm.* ii. 6. 18), and also one from Guido (ed. Parthey, 67, p. 502: "regionem Solentinam [sic] quae et Locria antiquitus dicta est, provincia Apulia est"), one might think that the Sybaris of Nicander, founded in Italy by the Locrians, was the one on the Sallentine peninsula. That a city of that name existed there is shown by Ovid *Met.* xv. 50 ff. (cf. my pamphlet, *Sibari nella Messapia* [Pisa]). Varro (apud Prob. ad Verg. *Ecl.* vi. 31) also speaks of Locrians in Messapia. But both the passage from Solinus, and a comparison between the legend of Eurybatus and that of Euthymus, render it unnecessary for me to refute this supposition.

taken by death, but after a long life becomes a hero of more than mortal nature. With the legend which Pausanias either heard at Olympia, or more probably reproduced from some early source, agrees the brief and concise account of Aelianus, who adds that Euthymus descended to the banks of the Caecinus and disappeared. With it agree also the words of Callimachus, as cited by Pliny:

Consecratus est vivos sentiensque eiusdem oraculi [i. e., of Delphi] iussu et Iovis deorum summi adstipulatu Euthymus pycta, semper Olympiae victor et semel victus. Patria ei Locri in Italia. Ibi imaginem eius et Olympiae alteram eodem die tactam fulmine Callimachum ut nihil aliud miratum video ad eumque iussisse sacrificare, quod et vivo factitatum et mortuo, nihil de eo mirum aliud quam hoc placuisse dis.[1]

With the myth of Euthymus may be compared that of Epidius, a hero of Nuceria who is said to have fallen into the neighboring Sarnus, and to have felt horns sprouting upon his forehead. Shortly afterward he disappeared and was worshiped as a god by the Alfaterni of Nuceria. From him M. Epidius, the rhetorician, and teacher of Augustus and Anthony, pretended to derive his origin.[2] This is a well-known form of myth, appearing also in the story of Aeneas, who fell into the Numicius and became a god.

The diffusion of the legend of Euthymus, as also the general use of the proverb concerning him, shows clearly that the legend was soon treated of in literature, and was possibly in origin a literary product. Stesichorus of Himera, though born at Metaurum and a citizen of a Locrian colony,[3] sang of the victory at the Sagras in a palinode, and told the adventures of Leonymus, the Croton leader, who was wounded by Ajax, the protecting deity of the Locrians, and on that account betook himself to Leuce, an island in the Euxine Sea sacred to Achilles, where he was healed of his wound, and where he saw Helen, who sent by him the well-known message to the poet.[4] One immediately suspects that the

[1] Plin. *N. H.* vii. 47; cf. Schneider, *Callimachea*, II, p. 579, fr. 399. Possibly fr. 493, p. 650, ὁ δ' ἐκ Λοκρῶν τείχεος Ἰταλικοῦ παρ' . . . . ἦεν ἀμύντωρ, refers also to Euthymus (cf. Bergk, *Ant. lyr.*, II, praef. p. xviii).

[2] Suet. *De rhetor.* 4. Epidius is also represented on the coins of Nuceria (cf. Head, *op. cit.*, p. 35).

[3] Cf. Suid., s. v. Στησίχορος; Steph. Byz., s. v. Μάταυρος.

[4] Paus. iii. 19. 11; cf. Bergk, *Poet. lyr. Graec.*, III[4], pp. 218 ff.

victory of the Locrians and of Euthymus at Temesa may have furnished the opportunity for a poet of the school of Stesichorus or Xenocritus of Locri to compose a similar song of victory, in which real and fantastic elements, both historical and mythical, were mingled.[1] It is hardly necessary to recall that the accounts which have come down to us are mainly derived from the learned Alexandrine poet Callimachus, who related other myths of this nature, and from the historian Timaeus, who collected the historical facts and the fables relating to the western Greeks.

Finally, the account of Pausanias is valuable for still another reason. The painting which was seen either by him or by his source was, according to his own confession, a reproduction of an ancient original. Archaeologists may decide upon the value of this statement for the history of painting. It will suffice for me to

[1] According to the explicit and authoritative testimony of Glaucus of Regium (apud Plut. *De mus.* 10; Müller, *F. H. G.*, II, p. 24, fr. 4), it as said of Xenocritus of Locri: *ἡρωϊκῶν γὰρ ὑποθέσεων πράγματα ἐχουσῶν ποιητὴν γεγονέναι.* Since Pausanias, where he says that Euthymus was a son of the river Caecinus, recalls the fact that the grasshoppers on one side of the river were vocal, and on the other not, and since the account of these grasshoppers given by Timaeus (see fr. 64, 65 in Müller, *F. H. G.*, I, pp. 206 ff.) is possibly connected with the songs of the Locrian poet Eunomus, concerning whose period we possess no information whatever, it may be supposed that Pausanias derived his information from some epinicion of Eunomus, either indirectly, as through Polemon, or, in the final analysis, through Timaeus. It should be noted, however, that Timaeus (both in Strab. vi, p. 260 C., and in Antigonus of Caeystus i) does not mention the Locrian vocal grasshoppers in connection with the Caecinus, but in connection with the Halex. Thucydides (iii. 99, 103) mentions these rivers separately, although he places them both in Locrian territory. According to Aelianus (*loc. cit.*) the Caecinus *ἐστὶ πρὸ τῆς τῶν Λοκρῶν πόλεως.* According to Pausanias, on the other hand, this river, which he alone calls *Καικίνης*, separated the territory of the Locrians from that of the Regians. The fact that Philistus (apud Steph. Byz., s. v.; Müller, *F. H. G.*, I, p. 86, fr. 10) speaks of a *Καίκινον Χωρίον Ἰταλικόν* is possibly in favor of Pausanias, who nevertheless depended on the same source as Aelianus. It is, however, natural to suppose that his words in regard to the position of the Caecinus and to the story of the grasshoppers are due to a *contaminatio* of two different accounts made by Pausanias himself, which forbids our indulging in suppositions concerning the author of the epinicion. It might be noted here that, if we accept the correction of Coray, who for the words *Λύκα πηγή* of Pausanias substitutes *Καλύκα πηγή*, we have another allusion to the school of Stesichorus, who sang of *Καλύκη*, the beloved of Euathlus (cf. Bergk, *Poet. lyr. Graec.*, III[4], p. 222, fr. 43). At any rate, the myth was most popular and appears frequently in later literature.

note that on the painting seen by Pausanias was recorded the river Καλαβρός, near Temesa.[1] It is known that the Romans gave the name of Iapygia to Calabria, and generally admitted that the name of Calabria passed over to Bruttium between the sixth and seventh centuries.

The passage from Pausanias has the further merit of making us better understand how the transition from one name to the other could have occurred, and adduces another favorable argument to the theory of Mommsen, who held that, before the arrival of the Greeks, southern Italy from the Gulf of Tarentum to the Strait of Messina was inhabited by a people of like descent.[2]

We are led to the same result by the name of Alybas, the δαίμων honored near Temesa, if this Ἀλύβας was really the name of the earliest city at Metapontum.[3]

[1] The name of a confluent of the river Marro (Metaurus) which rises in the mountain-range northeast of Regium, is also Calabrian.

[2] Mommsen, *Unterit. Dialekte,* pp. 97 ff.

[3] See Eustath. ad Hom. *Od.* xxiv. 304; Hesych. and Steph. Byz., s. v.; Apoll. *Lex.* 24. Whether or not Metapontum was the Homeric Alybas is another question.

FIG. 2.—Coin of the Alliance between Temesa and Croton.

FIG. 3.—Coins of Terina.

IV

TERINA, THE COLONY OF CROTON

Terina, a colony of Croton, was, to judge from its coins, one of the most flourishing of the Hellenic cities, and although it is rarely named by historians, we shall see that it nevertheless played an important part in the wars waged in Magna Graecia. Our first problem will be to determine its location. The critics who in recent years have treated this question have seen only a portion, and certainly the least important portion, of the truth. I think it possible to contribute new material and new considerations to the solution of the problem, thanks to which we shall better understand the important strategic position held by the city in former times.

According to the generally accepted opinion among Calabrian scholars, Terina should be sought near the river Savuto (the Sabatus), about four miles north of Nocera Inferiore, on a plateau where fragments of masonry are seen, and where numerous antiquities, have been discovered, among which were a few coins of Terina.[1] Lenormant in his last work, the book, both good and bad, which he wrote on Magna Graecia, has produced a strange mixture of keen observations and innumerable, possibly intentional, inaccuracies. In this he has thought it wise to take up again the problem of the topography of Temesa and Terina, and, as it seems to me, has rendered probable, or almost certain, that Terina was situated near the modern Fiume di S. Biase, in the valley of the Lamato, or Fiume di S. Ippolito (the Lametus or Lamatus of the ancients), on the very spot which is today termed Bagni di S. Eufemia. Temesa he places at Le Mattonate, two miles south of the Savuto.[2]

[1] L. Grimaldi, *Studi archeologici sulla Calabria ultra seconda* (Naples, 1845), p. 62.

[2] Lenormant, *La grande Grêce*, III, pp. 83 ff. I refer to this, although all of his assertions cannot be accepted. Thus I cannot follow his reasoning in the case of

The Calabrian scholar Marincola-Pistoia has recently treated of this subject in a monograph on the city of Terina; but, after reproducing the arguments of Lenormant, he remains undecided as to whether the city should be placed at S. Eufemia, or on the plateau already mentioned, which he says (without giving his authority), "still preserves the ancient name of the city in its present appellation of *Tirene* or *Tirina*."[1]

I gladly recognize the merit of Marincola-Pistoia, but in this case I doubt whether his assertion is of value, and suspect that he has been deceived. This would not be the first instance in which an ancient site has preserved the name given it by some local scholar who believed that he had discovered there the remains of the city of which he was in search. It often happens that later writers are mistaken, and believe to be local and popular tradition that which is merely the result of literary speculation.[2] Without a complete collection of the writings of Calabrian scholars on this subject it is useless to attempt to discover the origin of the confusion. It seems to me, however, that without doubt Terina should be sought in the valley of the Lameto. The *Sinus Terinaeus* of Pliny could not be derived from a city situated beyond Cape Suverum. For my own part I would rather seek the ruins of the ancient city of Temesa on the plateau near the Savuto.[3]

the coin of Terina which represents a nymph near a fountain, and bears the legend ΛΓΗ. This, following Mellingen, he thinks a corruption of Ἀγής, and to be the Ἀρής of Lycophron, vs. 730. It is now known that the ἀρής is not another river of Terina, but an epithet (=*ἰσχυρός*) of the Ocinarus (cf. the edition of Kinkel, p. 31; *Sch. Vet. ad loc.*, *ibid.*, p. 136). For the Homeric origin of this ἀρής see the observations on Lycophron by Scheer in the *Programm* of Ploen, 1876, pp. 25 ff. The Ἄγη of the coin, as has often been noted, is probably, the name of the designer (cf. Rathgeber, *Grossgriechenland u. Pythag.* [Gotha 1886], pp. 5 ff.

[1] Marincola-Pistoia, *Di Terina e di Lao* (Cantanzaro, 1886), p. 14. In this work mention is made of a rich Greek tomb from the time of Agathocles, found near S. Eufemia (cf. pp. 16 ff.).

[2] This kind of error is unfortunately perpetuated by the unconscious laxity of the government in too readily allowing certain municipalities to embellish themselves with ancient names which do not belong to them. This may seem an idle objection, and the matter is unimportant in itself, but as a result the government maps show many names which are destined either to create or to perpetuate both ancient and modern errors. Cf. Lenormant, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 24 ff.

[3] Even the excellent map of Kiepert which ornaments Vol. X of the *CIL*.

Lenormant was not the first to place Terina near S. Eufemia, and to recognize in the Fiume di S. Biase the Ocinarus of Lycophron. He was preceded, possibly without knowing it, by Rathgeber, who dedicated to Terina a good portion of that coarse and curious medley, entitled *Magnagrecia e Pitagora*, in which, mixed with many gratuitous assertions and tedious and absolutely unnecessary digressions, are found many valuable bibliographical data, and now and then some observation of value.[1]

There is no doubt that from the passages in ancient writers we should be led to place Terina in the valley of the Lamato, on the Tyrrhenian coast. Lycophron, on one of the two occasions when he mentions Terina, says that the body of the siren Ligea was carried by the waves to Terina, and that she was buried there by sailors near the mouth of the Ocinarus, which bathed her tomb.[2] Ligea was one of the three sirens who were honored on the coast of Campania and Lucania as far as Bruttium, and were worshiped in the localities which received their names; i. e., Parthenope (Naples), Leucosia (Cape Licosa), and Ligea (Terina).[3]

places Terina on the plateau of the Tirena, a strategic point which dominates the entrance to the valley of the Savuto and the approach to that of the Crathis. I should prefer to place there the ancient Temesa, and attach little importance to the fact that the distances in the Itineraries would rather lead us to place it two miles to the south (Torre del Casale? cf. Romanelli apud Marincola-Pistoia in *Opuscoli di storia patria* [Cantanzaro, 1871], p. 92). Lenormant (*op. cit.*, III, p. 89; cf. Marincola, *Di Terina*, etc., p. 21, n. 3) wrongly asserts that Temesa was situated at Le Mattonate, for in the course of centuries it may have been moved, even in antiquity, and either the Greek Temesa may not have been the one which still existed in the second century (cf. Paus. vi. 6. 10), or else the city may have been on the plateau near the Savuto, while at Torre del Casale were the mines of which Romanelli speaks, and which are said to have pertained to Homeric times (cf. Hom. *Od.* i. 184).

[1] Rathgeber, *op. cit.*, pp. 5 ff., 82 ff.

[2] Lycophr., vss. 726 ff.; cf. vss. 1008 ff.

[3] Solin. ii. 9, pp. 35 ff. Mommsen says of this: "Insula Ligea appellata ab eiecto ibi corpore Sirenis ita nominatae." He agrees, therefore, with Lycophron; cf. Steph. Byz., s. v. Τέρινα. The Calabrian historians (cf. apud Marincola-Pistoia, *Di Terina*, etc., p. 23) think this island is the rock between Nocera and the Savuto, termed *Pietra della Nave*. This was originally an island, although today it is joined to the mainland, thanks to the heavy deposits of the Calabrian *fiumare*. I have before me the map of the Italian *Stato Maggiore*, reduced by Kiepert to the

Pseudo-Scymnus (or his source) interrupts at Velia[1] his description of the Italian coast on the Tyrrhenian side, to describe the Aeolian islands and Sicily. He then takes up the coast again,[2] and, after mentioning the regions which he calls Italia, Oenotria, and Magna Graecia, he enumerates the Greek cities located there. Commencing at Terina, he says:

> Ἑλληνικὰς γοῦν παραθαλαττίους ἔχει
> πόλεις· Τέρειναν πρῶτον, ἣν ἀπῴκισαν
> Κροτωνιᾶται πρότερον.[3]

and proceeds to name Hipponium, Medma, Regium, etc. Moreover, Strabo states[4] that Terina was *συνεχής* to Temesa; and Pliny, who, as is well known, follows the same source as Strabo, which was probably Artemidorus, makes the same observation: "oppidum Tempsa a Graecis Temese dictum et Crotoniensium Terina sinusque ingens Terinaeus."[5]

There remains, however, one passage which, so far as I know, has hitherto been overlooked by critics, and which completely contradicts the above conclusion, in spite of its apparent finality. This is from no other than Thucydides, one of the earliest and most authoritative of authors, who narrates how Gylippus, having sailed from Thurii for Sicily in order to aid Syracuse, *παρέπλει τὴν Ἰταλίαν καὶ ἁρπασθεὶς ὑπ' ἀνέμου κατὰ τὸν Τεριναῖον κόλπον ὃς ἐκπνεῖ ταύτῃ μέγας κατὰ βορέαν ἑστηκώς*, was forced back to Tarentum by the tempest.[6]

There can be no doubt about the meaning of this: the Terinaean Gulf of Thucydides is the Scylacine Gulf famous for its tempests, the *navifragum Scylaceum* of Vergil.[7] How, then, shall we harmonize this passage with the preceding, and especially with that of Pliny, who gives the name "Terinaean" to the opposite

scale of 1:800,000. The map is relatively small, and yet in front of S. Eufemia is plainly seen a narrow tongue of land in the shape of a peninsula. It seems to me that this must originally have been the island of Ligea mentioned by the two ancient writers just quoted.

[1] Vs. 252.

[2] Pseud.-Scymn., vs. 300.

[3] Pseud.-Scymn., vs. 305.

[4] Strab. vi, p. 256 C.

[5] Plin. *N. H.* iii. 5. 72; cf. 10. 95.

[6] Thuc. vi. 104. 2.

[7] Verg. *Aen.* iii. 553.

gulf, which other authors—e. g., Antiochus—call Lametine, from the city or river of Lametus (today the Amato), or Hipponiate from the city of Hipponium (Monteleone)?

The difficulty might be avoided by supposing that Thucydides mistook one gulf for the other; but who would dare employ such a remedy, and accuse this learned and diligent writer of error? In the many and valuable data on the geography of Italy and Sicily which he has given us it would be useless to search for the slightest mistake. Moreover, there are no serious arguments which would lead us to agree with those who deny the value of the statements of Timaeus, according to whom Thucydides himself visited Italy.[1] The well-known description of Syracuse and its neighborhood is alone an excellent argument in favor of this statement.[2]

Before deciding, then, that Thucydides was wrong, it is necessary to seek some means for checking his data. I believe that this is possible, and am convinced that Terina was neither to the west nor the east of the point where the two Silae ranges[3] sink suddenly and form the Lamatine and Scylacine Gulfs, but lay in a central position, precisely at the point where today is situated the town of Tiriolo, which, at a height of about 540 meters above the sea, dominates the two gulfs, of which either might with justice be termed Terinaean, and commands by its position the means of communication with the surrounding territory.[4]

This theory is based on two series of facts. In the first place, Tiriolo is a conspicuous archaeological center. The numerous finds, from flints and stone axes to the artistic products of the best Greek period, suffice to show that a flourishing Greek city once occupied this site. The museum of Cantanzaro, which I visited several years ago, may to a certain extent be called the museum of

[1] Tim. apud Marcell. *Vit. Thuc.* 40. 52. Timaeus was, however, in error in asserting that Thucydides died in Italy (cf. Marcell. *ibid.* 52).

[2] Cf. Holm, *Die Stadt Syrakus im Alterthum* (ed. Lupus, Strassburg, 1887), pp. 114 ff., who has worked out this theme better than anyone else.

[3] See below, pp. 59, 63, for the phrase "the two Silae."

[4] Calabrian writers agree that Tiriolo was an ancient city (cf. Grimaldi, *op. cit.*, pp. 79 ff.), and have evolved strange theories in this connection. That it occupies the site of Terina has hitherto escaped notice.

Terina. Even a hasty examination of this scientific institute will convince anyone of the truth of this assertion.[1] At Tiriolo was found the famous *senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus*, but it is not possible, as will be shown, that the ancient town was the *ager Teuranus* mentioned in the inscription. A poor *vicus* could not leave so many and valuable remains, and Terina is the only name that can be given to the city which once flourished there and which is attested by numerous monuments, since no other is mentioned as having existed in that region.

On the other hand, I hold that Terina played an important part in the military history of antiquity. It was founded by the inhabitants of Croton for the same reason that they either founded or seized both Scylacium and Caulonia on the Ionian Sea.[2] Although on a few occasions Croton had been the avowed ally of Sybaris[3] she was in general her rival, as also that of Locri. These two cities possessed maritime colonies on the Tyrrhenian coast, and pressed upon the territory of Croton from either side. To compete successfully with Sybaris, who was mistress of the valley of the Crathis and also of a portion of the Tyrrhenian coast, where she had the colonies of Posidonia, Laos, and Scidrus, it was necessary to fortify the entire neck of land between the Hipponiate and Scylacine Gulfs. The possession of this made it possible for Croton to carry on commerce by portages through the valleys of the Corace and Fiume di S. Biase, just as the Sybarites and Locrians crossed the peninsula to reach their colonies of Mesma and Hipponium.[4]

[1] It would be worth while for someone, preferably one thoroughly acquainted with the region, to catalogue the finds made at Tiriolo.

[2] That Terino was a colony of Croton is expressly stated by Pseud.-Scymn., vss. 306 ff.; Plin. *N. H.* iii. 5. 72; Solin. ii. 10; Phleg. Trall., fr. 18, ed. Keller; and obscurely by Lycophron, vss. 1008 ff.; cf. *Sch. Vet. ad loc.* For Caulonia see Pseud.-Scymn., vs. 319; Solin., *loc. cit.*, Steph. Byz., s. v. Αὐλών. For Scylacium or Squillace see Strab. vi, p. 261 C.

[3] Cf. the staters of Croton on which also the name of Σύ(βαρις) is found (Head, *op. cit.*, p. 80).

[4] For Laos and Scidrus see Herodot. vi. 21; cf. Strab. vi, p. 253 C. For Hipponium and Mesma see Thuc. v. 5. 3; Pseud.-Scymn., vs. 308; cf. Strab. vi, p. 256 C.

To succeed in their purpose, the inhabitants of Croton seized upon Caulonia on the Ionian Sea and assured themselves of full liberty of action toward Locri. On the Tyrrhenian side they either seized or allied themselves with Temesa at the mouth of the Savuto, which was both politically and commercially a point of defense against Sybaris and Locri.[1] In order to secure means of communication between the two gulfs, it was necessary to possess the key to the intervening neck of land; and this was found at its highest point, where the northern Sila range sinks rapidly to Tiriolo. This position not only commanded the two gulfs, but was a useful point of offense and defense against the valley of the Crathis, where was situated Pandosia, the Oenotrian capital which soon became the ally of Croton.[2]

The above-mentioned circumstances, and also the fact that on the Tyrrhenian side Croton exercised control at least over Temesa, show clearly that she had no need of founding Terina in the immediate neighborhood of that city. Moreover, Terina is mentioned as a place of great strategic importance even in connection with later events. For this reason the Thurians, the successors of the Sybarites, moved against her under Cleandridas;[3] and when the Brettians, the earliest inhabitants of Bruttium, rebelled against the Lucanians and founded an autonomous government (about 356 B. C.), they attacked Terina first of all, and then moved against Hipponium, Thurii, and the other Italiot cities.[4]

[1] The alliance between Temesa and Croton in the fifth century is known to all numismatists (cf. Head, *op. cit.*, pp. 80, 96). Garrucci alone (*Le monete dell' Italia antica,* II, pp. 147 ff., Plate CIX, no. 6) wrongly opposes the identification of Temesa with the city designated by the letters TE, which he believes to refer to Terina. His statement is confuted by the coin which he himself publishes (Plate CXVI, no. 27), bearing the objects common to the coins of Croton and Temesa (helmet, greaves, and tripod), and the legend TEM.

[2] That relations existed between Croton, Temesa, and Pandosia in the fifth century is known only from coins (cf. Head, *op. cit.*, pp. 80, 90). We shall later discuss this matter in full detail.

[3] Polyaen. ii. 10. 1; Antioch. apud Strab. vi, p. 264 C.; Diod. xiii. 106. 10.

[4] Diod. xvi. 15. 2: *καὶ πρῶτον μὲν Τερῖναν πόλιν ἐκπολιορκήσαντες, διήρπασαν, ἔπειτα Ἱππώνιον καὶ Θουρίους καὶ πολλὰς ἄλλας χειρωσάμενοι κοινὴν πολιτείαν συνέθεντο.*

This last statement is inexplicable if Terina is placed near the sea, but is easily understood if we admit that the Brettians besieged Tiriolo, which was the necessary key for those desiring free passage both toward Thurii, through the valley of the Crathis, and toward Hipponium. It was on account of this position that Alexander the Molossian captured Terina when he moved against the Brettians.[1] And finally, by holding that Terina was at Tiriolo, we understand why Hannibal, when compelled to leave Italy and return home, "destroyed Terina which he was not able to guard," as Strabo says,[2] thus treating it in the same way as he did the soldiers and horses he could not take with him. These last, we know, he put to death before he sailed.[3]

Terina, therefore, is mentioned in connection with nearly all the military events which occurred in Magna Graecia between the fourth and second centuries B. C., and presents itself as an important strategic point.[4] It requires no great amount of military learning to recognize that it must have been situated in some strong position, and not in the level valley of the Lamato near the S. Biase River. Had it been located here, it would have been difficult to understand why it should have occurred to Hannibal to destroy a place which was not worth guarding, and which had none of the strategic advantages which Terina certainly possessed.[5]

These results seem to me fairly certain, although they flatly contradict the preceding statements. This discrepancy becomes still more evident from what follows. At Tiriolo in 1640 was found the text of the celebrated *senatus consultum de Bacchanalibus* of 186 B. C., in which it is said that it was promulgated "in agro

[1] Liv. viii. 24. The words *ac Terinam* in the texts were proposed by Sigonio in place of the *acrentinam* of the codices.

[2] Strab. vi, p. 256 C.: *Τερῖνα ἣν Ἀννίβας καθεῖλεν οὐ δυνάμενος φυλάττειν ὅτε δὴ εἰς αὐτὴν καταπεφεύγει τὴν Βρεττίαν* (therefore between 207 and 203 B. C.).

[3] App. *B. Hann.* 60; cf. Liv. xxx. 20.

[4] Cf. also Liv. xxv. 1, for the year 213 B. C.

[5] It was because there was no city and no position on the Gulf of Hipponium that had a situation of a strategic character, that the Romans, when they sent a military colony to Croton, sent another to Temesa (cf. Liv. xxxiv. 45, for the year 194 B. C.).

Teurano."[1] Strabo says that ὑπὲρ δὲ τῶν Θουρίων was the Ταυριανὴ χώρα.[2] It seems to me certain, other writers, including Mommsen, to the contrary, that this *ager Teuranus* is identical with Tiriolo. We need not be surprised that the Greek Τέρεινα or Τερῖνα was transformed into the noun from which the adjective *Teuranus* is derived. It is probable that the Greeks who occupied the place modified the indigenous name, sounding like *Tauros* (which reappears in the form Ταυριανὴ χώρα, and presents itself again farther on in Bruttium,[3] and produced the new form Τέρεινα, which is equivalent to the Latin *tener*.[4] But even were this incorrect, it would not be surprising if the Lucanians or the Bruttians had modified the Greek form to make of it an *ager Teuranus*. Was it not the Lucanians who coined the uncouth Paestum from Posidonia?

Thus it is not strange that the *senatus consultum* mentions a *vicus*, and not a city, at Tiriolo in 186 B. C. This circumstance agrees perfectly with the passage from Strabo previously quoted, to the effect that Terina had been destroyed by Hannibal about twenty years before the promulgation of this document. Moreover, the decree was intended to suppress a religious institution which could have flourished only in a place having a dense and civilized, and even corrupt, population. From this it is evident that at Tiriolo, which at that time was merely a *vicus*, there had formerly flourished an important city.

I am struck, however, by the fact that Strabo himself, who

[1] *CIL*, X. 104.

[2] Strab. vi, p. 254 C.

[3] Cf. Plin. *N. H.* iii. 73: "Metaurus amnis Taurentum oppidum;" Pomp. Mel. ii. 68: "Taurianum et Metaurum;" or the Ταριανὸς σκόπελος of Ptol. iii. 1. 9, which Calabrian writers wrongly confound with Terina. Mommsen (*CIL*, X, 104) rightly distinguishes these places from the *ager Teuranus*, but without reason asserts that either the Ταυριανὴ χώρα of Strabo was not the same as this, or else the Greek geographer indicated such a place "perperam omnino." Strabo always describes the interior of a country with less accuracy and under general headings only. His words leave no doubt in my mind that he intended to record the *ager Teuranus* or Tiriolo.

[4] The form Τέρεινα of Pseudo-Scymnus is not an error. It is confirmed by several coins; cf. Imhoof-Blumer, "Zur Münzkunde Grossgriechenlands, Sicilien, etc.," *Numis. Zeitschr.* (Vienna), X (1878), pp. 25 f.

speaks of a Ταυριανὴ χώρα, also mentions[1] a Terina συνεχής to Temesa. There is evidently a reference to two different places. To harmonize these contradictory results we are led to inquire whether there were not possibly two cities bearing the name of Terina. My own opinion is that there was originally but one Terina, on the summit of Mount Tiriolo, and that this had as an offshoot a second Terina, situated near S. Eufemia on the Tyrrhenian coast. I hope to show at least the probability of this theory.

We have seen that Croton was absolute mistress of the Scylacine Gulf. In like manner she could also be considered mistress of the Gulf of Hipponium through her alliance with Temesa. Temesa, however, was too far distant from the gulf proper to enable her to derive much commercial advantage from the large and fertile valley of the Lamato. On the other hand, it is evident that, if Terina on the mountain was to flourish, she would have to seek an outlet by sea. This she could not find on the Scylacine Gulf, for there was Scylacium, the ancient Ionian city, which had also been obliged to recognize the supremacy or dominion of Croton. Her natural outlet, and one which would especially attract the Terinaeans on account of the greater fertility of the soil, was through the opposite valley, which was the largest in Bruttium next to that of Locrian Mesma.

On the Tyrrhenian coast, near S. Eufemia, there was thus bound to arise a Terinaean emporium, just as on the neighboring coast arose the emporium of Hipponium, and just as on the shores of Sicily arose the emporia of Agrigentum, Eryx, and Segesta. And in the same way that these last-named cities maintained the names of their respective metropoles,[2] so, it seems to me, the emporium of S. Eufemia must have kept the name of Terina, and may well have become of greater importance than its parent-city. This is what happened to Eryx or S. Giuliano, which both in ancient and in modern times became deserted as soon as times of peace favored the commerce of Trapani.

[1] *Loc. cit.*

[2] For the ἐπίνειον of Agrigentum and the ἐμπόριον of Segesta, see Strab. vi, p. 272 C. For the ἐμπόριον of Eryx, see Diod. xxiv. 11.

Just what causes developed and made prosperous the city which we shall henceforth call the maritime Terina, at the expense of the Terina of the mountains, it is not easy to determine, since the material for building up the history of Magna Graecia, always scanty, is especially so for the period between the destruction of Sybaris and the time of the Dionysii. A little light is thrown on the subject by combining the slight literary evidence with the data derived from coins.

The coins of Terina from the beginning of the fifth century bear witness to the prosperity of this colony of Croton, while the legend ΝΙΚΑ attests the triumph of the political policy of Terina and Croton together.[1] The coins from the middle of the same century also tend to show that Terina as well as the Siceliot cities commemorated the fall of the tyrants.[2] Finally, those from the fourth century prove that, together with Regium, Mesma, and Locri, she participated in the political events of the period.

We know that Dionysius I succeeded in subjugating all of the Greek cities on the flanks of the southern Sila (i. e., Regium, Caulonia, and Scylacium, colonies of Croton, and Hipponium), and that he favored his ally Locri by practically giving her the territory of the conquered cities, with the exception of Regium. Later Croton herself was captured by the great tyrant. We have no record of the fate which befell Terina in this period, but certainly she must have suffered the same lot as her sister cities and her own metropolis. On the thirds of the Terinaean staters of the time of

[1] Head, *op. cit.*, p. 96; e. g., Fig. 64. I do not hesitate to attribute the legend ΝΙΚΑ to joint victories of Terina and Croton. I shall treat elsewhere of these victories, and of the juridical relations existing between the autonomous city, which struck its own coins, and the metropolis. Here I merely wish to note that from the coin of Terina of the middle of the fifth century, on which is seen a fountain and the legend ΑΓΗ (Garrucci, *op. cit.*, p. 169, Plate CXVII, no. 5), it might be inferred that Terina at that time was near the sea, since the fountain seems to be the source of the Bagni S. Eufemia, the *Aquae Ange* of the Itineraries. This identification, however, is anything but certain; and if it were, what would it prove? On the coins of Eryx is sometimes seen the crab, the symbol of the port, placed at the foot of the mountain, and Terina may possibly in a similar manner have recorded a monument which she possessed in her emporium.

[2] Imhoof-Blumer, *Monnaies grecques* (Amsterdam, 1882), p. 11, n. 44.

Dionysius I is frequently seen the Sicilian triskele.[1] This confirms our belief that Terina also recognized the supremacy of Syracuse.

It remains to discover at what period the city situated on the summit of the mountain lost her power, and there is one circumstance to be noted which seems to refer to this. When, after 389, Dionysius had conquered the Italiots at the Helorus, and subjugated Hipponium, Caulonia, and Scylacium, he decided to construct a wall on the isthmus between the Gulfs of Scylacium and Hipponium, in order to defend his new acquisitions against the Lucanians, the very invaders in common with whom he had made war upon the Italiots a short time before. We know from Strabo, who has preserved this statement, that he was compelled to desist from this undertaking by those who lived beyond the isthmus.[2]

Who were those who prevented Dionysius from carrying out his undertaking? Strabo himself tells us this when he asserts that the idea of the wall came to Dionysius while he was making war on the Lucanians, and it is evident that they are the ones who are meant. Certainly it could not have been the inhabitants of Croton, recently humiliated by the defeat at the Helorus, and weakened by the loss of their colonies of Sylacium and Caulonia. They were themselves threatened with the loss of their autonomy and liberty, and had neither the heart nor the strength to oppose the tyrant. Thus the Lucanians themselves must have seized the mountain Terina between 389 and 379 B. C.[3] and in this way have prevented the construction of the wall, which would have stood in the way of their plans for future invasion and conquest. It is also probable that at that time the inhabitants of the mountain Terina took refuge in their emporium by the sea, which itself then became an autonomous city and commenced to coin its own money.[4]

[1] Head, *op. cit.*, p. 98.

[2] Strab. vi, p. 261 C.: ἀλλ' ἐκώλυσαν οἱ ἐκτὸς ἐπελθόντες; cf. Plin. *N. H.* iii. 10. 95.

[3] Croton was not taken by Dionysius till about 379 B. C.; cf. Unger, *Sitzungsberichte* of the Academy of Munich, 1876, pp. 569 ff. The attempt to build the wall across the isthmus therefore falls between 389 or 388, when Caulonia and Hipponium were captured (Diod. xiv. 106 ff.), and 379 B. C.

[4] The periplus of Pseud.-Scyl., p. 12 (composed, as we know, about the middle of the fourth century), ignores the Brettians and places Terina in Lucania.

This conclusion is confirmed by an examination of the Terinaean staters of the Corinthian type and weight, which have correctly been compared with the similar staters of the same period from Locri and Regium, which, according to the generally accepted opinion, were struck when the Corinthian Timoleon freed Syracuse from the tyrants.[1] These staters show that during the rule of the two Dionysii Terina endured the same fate as did the other vassal cities of Bruttium, such as Hipponium, Caulonia, Regium, Mesma, and Locri. She was perhaps nominally added to the territory of Locri, on a par with Caulonia and Hipponium.[2] It seems evident to me that these staters were struck at maritime, and not at mountain, Terina. Toward the middle of the fourth century (c. 356 B. C.) this latter city was seized from the Brettians by the Lucanians. The Brettians were descendants of the earliest inhabitants of the country, and still possessed Terina, although for short periods it had been taken from them by Alexander the Molossian, and by Hannibal.

That the emporium of the Terinaeans had become of even more importance than their mountain city, even before the destruction of the latter by Hannibal, is shown by the fact that Lycophron (about the middle of the third century B. C.) placed Terina on the Tyrrhenian coast. The increase of power of the maritime city may possibly date from the time when Alexander the Molossian conquered the mountain metropolis (between about 335 and 331 B. C.), for Pseudo-Scymnus, possibly following Ephorus, calls Terina

[1] See Head, *op. cit.*, p. 86. Imhoof-Blumer ("Münzen Akarnaniens," *Num. Zeitschr.*, Vienna, X [1878], pp. 6 ff.) notes that Bruttium is one of the six regions in which coins of the Corinthian type appear. The cities represented are Locri, Mesma, Regium, and Terina. The numerous points of resemblance between the coins of Locri, Hipponium, and Terina are well known. It will suffice to recall the fourth-century coins of Hipponium and Terina with the name and image of the goddess Pandina.

[2] Cf. Diod. xiv. 106 ff. Mesma is not named among the cities conquered by Dionysius, but Diodorus states that he stationed 4,000 Mesmaeans at Messana, when he founded there a military colony (Diod. xiv. 78, for the year 396 B. C). This shows, as other writers have already noted (cf. Marincola-Pistoia, *Opuscoli*, p. 215), that Mesma had fallen into the hands of the tyrant, who, in like manner transported to Sicily the inhabitants of Caulonia and Hipponium.

παραθαλαττία.[1] With this in mind it becomes even more probable that at the time of Timoleon and Dionysius II, rather than at that of Dionysius I, and subsequent to the Lucanian invasian, the emporium of the Terinaeans developed into an important city at the expense of the metropolis, which, although it continued to exist, gradually lost the character of a city and assumed that of a single fortress. Finally, through Hannibal, it lost even this distinction, and became a simple village, the *ager Teuranus* of the *senatus consultum.*[2]

If the theories which we have set forth in the foregoing are true, or at least worthy of being taken into consideration, in the very word "Tiriolo," which seems derived from the complete form "Tereniolum," we find a phonetic proof of the decay and loss of power which befell the once flourishing Italiot city.[3]

[1] It is true that Pseud.-Scymn. (see 305 ff.) also uses the term *παραθαλαττία* of Hipponium, which was situated somewhat less than ten kilometers from the sea, and that geographers describe such cities as Eryx and Agrigentum, which are really several kilometers inland, as being situated on the coast. On the same principle the Terina which was situated at Tiriolo might perhaps also be said to be on the coast, since it dominated both gulfs. It should be remembered, however, that Terina is about twenty-five kilometers from the sea in a straight line. It is also possible that Pseudo-Scymnus may here follow Timaeus instead of Ephorus.

[2] We do not know whether the Terinaean Elysius came from the mountain or from the maritime city. He is mentioned by a fourth-century writer, Crantor of Soli, who is the source of Cic. *Tusc.* i. 115, and of Plut. *Ad Apol.* 14. We may possibly see a citizen of the maritime Terina in that Philip who was put to shame at Olympia by Demosthenes (cf. Pseud.-Plut. *Vit. Dem.* 23).

[3] The words of Apollonides of Nicaea (apud Steph. Byz., s. v. **Τέρινα**= Müller, *F. H. G.*, IV, p. 310), *ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ καὶ μεγάλη Ἑλλάς*, would seem to allude to the great importance of Terina in antiquity; but there is some doubt about the correctness of the passage. Much more important in this connection are the numerous archaeological finds from the neighborhood of Terina. For these see *Notizie degli Scavi*, 1881, p. 172; 1882, p. 390; 1883, p. 137; 1898, p. 274.

FIG. 4.—Coin of the Alliance between Sybaris and Posidonia.

V

THE ORIGIN OF SIRIS

Siris, on the coast of Chonia in Magna Graecia, was held to have been founded first by the Trojans and later by the Ionians of Colophon. The Achaean founders of Metapontum, Sybaris, and Croton are said to have besieged and captured it, and to have slaughtered its inhabitants at the foot of the altar of Athena Polias.[1] It is further stated that the Athenians, who even in the West represented the rights and traditions of the Ionians, wished to refound the city and seize its rich territory. When, therefore, according to Herodotus, on the eve of the battle of Salamis the Spartan Eurybiades refused to follow the counsels of Themistocles, he threatened to go with his fellow-citizens to the Siritis in Italy, which, according to an oracle, was to be repopulated by Athenians.[2] The Siritis became an object of contention among the colonists who under the auspices of Athens had founded Thurii, the successor of Sybaris, and on that account Siris did not rise from its ruins with its ancient name, but when, in 433 B. C., the Tarentines had brought about an agreement concerning the possession of the Siritis, the inhabitants of Siris were transferred a short distance to Heraclea. Both contending parties were granted the right of inhabiting the Siritis, and Heraclea, which had been founded under the auspices of Tarentum, was considered as its metropolis.[3]

It is not my intention here to discuss the passages which relate to the Siritis and to Heraclea in the following period, but rather to

[1] Tim. et Arist. apud Athen. xii, p. 523 *d;* Strab. vi, p. 246 C.; cf. Lycophr., vs. 989, and *Sch. Vet. ad loc.;* Pseud.-Arist. *De mir. ausc.* 106, p. 840 Bk.; Iust. xx. 24; Steph. Byz., s. v. Πολίειον; cf. *Etym. magn.*, s. v. Also see my *Storia della Sicilia,* etc., I, p. 225, and E. Ciaceri in his noteworthy comment on the *Alexandra* of Lycophron (Catania, 1901, pp. 281 ff.). The opposite opinion has been set forth by Beloch (*Hermes,* XXIX [1904], pp. 604 ff.).

[2] Herodot. viii. 62: ἀναλαβόντες τοὺς οἰκέτας κομιεύμεθα ἐς Σῖριν τὴν ἐν Ἰταλίᾳ, ἥπερ ἡμετέρη τέ ἐστι ἐκ παλαιοῦ ἔτι, καὶ τὰ λόγια λέγει ὑπ' ἡμέων αὐτὴν δεῖ κτισθῆναι.

[3] Diod. xii. 36. 3.

examine in some detail those which refer to the origin of Siris —a city whose beauty, according to a fragment preserved by Athenaeus, was compared by Archilochus of Paros with the less-pleasing charms of the island of Thasos.[1] Archilochus is said to have been a contemporary of the Lydian Gyges.[2] If, however, as ancient writers affirm, it is true that Siris was founded by Ionians who were fleeing from the domination of the Lydians, it follows that, if the Ionian Archilochus of Paros did not participate directly in the colonization of Ionian Siris, as it is said the poet Eumelus did in that of Syracuse, and Herodotus in that of Thurii, he at least had occasion to see the Italiot city at its very beginning.

It is this question of Ionic origin which has recently become an object of dispute among students. It is asked how Siris could have been an Ionic city, when its coins from the middle of the fifth century bear inscriptions in the Achaean alphabet; and how Ionians from Ionia could have come to Italy, although, with the exception of the Phocaeans, during the following century no other people from that region founded colonies in the West. The Colophonians inhabited a Mediterranean city, and it is even doubtful whether they ever took part in such colonization. Everything, therefore, would lead us to believe that Siris also was of Achaean origin. When we read in Herodotus that Themistocles threatened to go to the Siritis as to a land which from early times had belonged to the Athenians, this is explained, we are told, by the fact that Herodotus wrote at the time when Thurii and Tarentum contended for the Siritis. A drama of Euripides, Μελανίππη Δεσμῶτις, is said to have been the occasion for the final localizing of the myth of Metapontus, husband of Siris, who founded the city of Metapontum in Italy and gave rise to the legend that Siris was of

[1] Archil. apud Athen. xii, p. 23 *d;* fr. 21 in Bergk, *P. L. G.*, II[4], p. 389. A Siris which existed in Paeonia is mentioned by Herodotus (viii. 115; cf. v. 15) in connection with the military operations of the Persians. The explicit statement by Athenaeus that the Siris mentioned by the poet was the one in Italy prevents us from thinking that he was alluding to the Paeonian city of the same name, which was nearer Thasos. I do not understand why the visit of Archilochus to Siris is not mentioned by modern writers on Greek literature, such as Christ, *Geschichte d. griech. Litt.*, 3d ed., p. 135, and Croiset, *Hist. de la litt. grecque*, II[2], p. 179.

[2] Archil., fr. 25; cf. Herodot. i. 12.

Metapontine origin. We are told, in addition, that the tomb of Calchas, who is said to have been buried at Colophon, cannot be cited as evidence of the tradition that Siris was founded by the Colophonians, because the myth was due merely to the confusion of the Greek Calchas with the hero Κάλχος, whose tomb was also pointed out in Daunia.[1]

Such, in sum and substance, are the observations made by Beloch a few years ago on the origin of Siris. The standing of Beloch as a critic is undisputed, but in this case his statements do not seem to be borne out by the passages in ancient literature, as I hope to show in the following pages.

Little needs to be said concerning the pretended arrival of the Trojans on the coast of the Siritis, where they are said to have founded a city similar to Troy, which received the name of Πολίειον. Certain modern archaeologists show a tendency to accept such legends, and possibly they will some day be able through new discoveries to substantiate the available literary and linguistic data and to persuade those who oppose them. For the moment it will suffice to recall that the tradition of the arrival of the Trojans in Latium was preceded by others referring to their arrival, not only on the coast of the Siritis, but also in the region where Achaean Croton was founded. Still other versions stated that they came to the Cyrenaica, where as early as the fifth century Pindar had localized the same Antenor who according to later writers came to the Veneti. It is likewise known that the Sicilian sources of Thucydides spoke of fugitive Trojans who came to the extreme western portion of the island inhabited by the Elymians. In support of such arrival of the Trojans ancient writers even gave monumental evidence. The historian Timaeus, who in this respect also preceded our scientists and archaeologists, observed that Trojan vases were preserved in the temple of the Penates at Lavinium; and the same Timaeus, or another writer who was either the direct or the indirect source of Strabo, derived confirmation for the coming of the Trojans to the Siritis from the presence

[1] Beloch (*op. cit.*) accepts the observations of Stoll and Immisch in Roscher, II, 1, col. 923.

of a statue of Athena Polias, which was preserved even in historic times, and which displayed Trojan characteristics. In speaking of a miracle which was said to have been worked by this statue, Strabo shows himself displeased by such reports,[1] and also displays irritation at having to record that in many other localities, such as Rome, Lavinium, Luceria in Daunia, and in the Siritis, statues of Athena of ostensibly Trojan origin were shown.

Ancient writers who believed thoroughly in such accounts may perhaps have accused Strabo of being hypercritical, but we of the present day have no more difficulty in believing Strabo to be right than we have in agreeing with those who are skeptical concerning the many teeth of St. Apollonia, the numerous pieces of the true Cross, and the portions of the garments of the Madonna, which in many places are preserved as sacred relics. The conclusion is obvious that the statue of Athena which was held to be of Trojan origin in reality belonged to the oldest period of Greek art, together with statues from the hands of such workmen as Daedalus, which are mentioned by the Greeks as existing in their ancient colonies, and even among the Veneti and other indigenous peoples of Italy. The fact is that the present state of our knowledge forbids our criticizing the stylistic and chronological judgment of the ancients, and that the problem is impossible of solution.

Of more importance for our purpose is the fact that the earliest inhabitants of the regions where later Greek Siris and Croton arose, were the Chones, whose name recalls that of the Chaones of Epirus. Both the Chaones and the Chones were in antiquity

[1] The fact that the miracle to which Strabo, Lycophron, and Trogus Pompeius allude, is said to have occurred, according to the first-mentioned writer, at the time when the Ionians seized Siris, and, according to the others, when the Achaeans slaughtered the Ionians, may be due as much to different narrations of the miracles worked by the goddess as to the inexactness of the epitomizer of Strabo. These chronological variations do not make it certain that the sources were divergent, for in the last analysis the common source was possibly Timaeus. Moreover, the same contempt with which Strabo refers to this fact is displayed by the opinion which both he and his model Polybius held of Timaeus, whom Strabo especially avoids consulting directly, and quotes as little as possible. The hypothesis of Chavannes (*De Palladii raptu* [Berlin, 1891], referred to by Beloch, *op. cit.*, p. 607, n. 1) concerning the shape of the eyes of archaic statues which seem to have the eyes closed deserves attention.

judged to be Trojans, and in addition we find among both peoples mention of the Pelasgians. But even though the Trojan question is one which the majority of the best modern critics regard as the result of late literary and political speculation, the mention of the Pelasgians takes us back to real historical beginnings. Nothing is more certain than the presence of the early Pelasgians in Epirus, the region where the Chaones were the earliest and most powerful inhabitants; and there is, on the other hand, no reason for doubting the statement that the indigenous slaves of the Italiots were termed Pelasgians.[1] And just as the Chaones came from Epirus to Italy, so too may have come the Pelasgians, who together with the Chaones may have been the earliest emigrants from the coast of Epirus, which was less than a day's sail from the shores of the Sallentine peninsula. It is with the arrival of these early emigrants that the name of Chaonic Pandosia is connected. This was situated not far from Heraclea, and near the place where the so-called Ionians founded the city of Siris.

It now remains to decide whether the founders of Siris were really Ionians, as is asserted by Aristotle and Timaeus, and whether they came as exiles fleeing from the yoke of the Lydians. Before attempting to give an adequate answer to this question, it is, however, necessary to consider briefly the source of the statements which have hitherto been mentioned. There exist today two noteworthy tendencies among students of antiquity: one, to believe everything which Greek and Roman tradition relates concerning the periods of Italian history for which we have no contemporary writings; and the other, to deny faith in the few periods of Greek history for which, even though we have no writings of contemporary historians, we have at least the works of the poets who narrated real events, and whose productions were either repeated or made use of by later prose-writers.

The fact that the Colophonian origin of Sybaris is mentioned by both Aristotle and Timaeus cannot be dissociated from the fact that Timaeus seized every occasion to attack his predecessors, and that Aristotle was among those whom he bitterly refuted, as is

[1] Steph. Byz. s. v. Χίος.

shown by the harsh manner in which he criticizes him in connection with the origin of Epizephyrian or Italian Locri.[1] When, therefore, Timaeus agrees with Aristotle, it is not because he repeats the latter's opinions, but because he was following a common source which he held to be authoritative.

In seeking out this common source, we find ourselves able to present a hypothesis which even on close examination seems most reasonable. We know that the Colophonian poet Xenophanes narrated the history of his native land, and that in a poem of two thousand lines he also set forth the events connected with the foundation of Velia, in which he participated. Moreover, from a fragment of his writings we learn that in one of his parodies, in speaking of the invasion of the Persians,[2] he alluded to Velia. It is, therefore, most probable that in his verses and in the history of his native land he would have alluded to the colonization of the Colophonians in the Siritis. We have seen that the verses of the Parian Archilochus made reference to the beauty of Siris, and it seems reasonable to suppose that the Colophonian Mimnermus, who related the arrival of Diomede among the Daunians, also took occasion to localize at Siris the myth and the Colophonian cult of Calchas.[3] Thus writers who were contemporary with the foundation of Siris, and who were citizens of Ionian colonies, or even of Colophon itself, alluded, if not with certainty, at least with great probability, to the origin of Siris, and we understand how Aristotle and Timaeus, two of the greatest and most diligent scholars of Greece, were able to draw upon authoritative works for their accounts of the origin of this Italiot city. To depreciate the value of their statements would without doubt overstep the bounds of just criticism. It is clear that even though the critic should not believe too readily in events which are not verified by the direct or indirect authority of contemporary historians, he should not, without sufficient reason, brand as spurious, or as the

[1] Tim. apud Polyb. xii. 5 ff.; and Athen. vi, pp. 264, 272. Cf. my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, pp. 199 ff.

[2] Diog. Laert. ix. 2. 20; Xenoph. apud Athen. ii, 54 *e*.

[3] For Diomede and the Daunians see Mimn., fr. 22, in Bergk, *P. L. G.*, II[4], p. 33. Cf. my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, pp. 352, 574.

result of late literary speculation, accounts which rest on the statements of authors who were contemporary with the events narrated, or who learned of them from those who either participated in, or were witnesses of, the deeds recorded.

Since there seems no reason for doubting the authority of the statements referring to the arrival of the Ionians on the shores of the Siritis, we may discuss with greater confidence the value of the observations made by the critic who denies the importance of such evidence. It is known that the Ionians of Ionia spread by preference along the shores of the Thracian Bosphorus, the Propontis, and the Black Sea; but it does not follow from this that they wholly refrained from voyaging westward. Aside from isolated facts—e. g., the discovery of Tartessus attributed to the Samian Coleius—such circumstances as the participation of the Samians, about 530 B. C., in the colonization of Cale Acte in Sicily, and the excellent commercial relations which existed between the Ionians of Miletus and the Achaeans of Sybaris, show that the West had also occupied their attention. Of still greater importance is the fact that when Harpagus, the general of Cyrus, about 543 B. C., undertook the conquest of the Ionian cities, Bias of Pirene advised the Ionians to abandon the coast of Asia Minor entirely and to go to Sardinia—advice which Herodotus thought to be most prudent.[1] In this case their love of their native land proved stronger than that of independence. The Phocaeans, however, who had already entered into favorable commercial relations with the West, and had founded Massilia (modern Marseilles) and Aleria (in Corsica), decided, at least in part, to turn again toward those shores; and, after a brief sojourn in Corsica, they betook themselves to the Ionian-Chalcidian Regium, and, with the aid of that city and of Posidonia, founded Velia on the coast of Oenotria, near the modern Cilento.[2]

Among those who founded Velia was a citizen of Colophon, the poet Xenophanes, who established the famous Eleatic School. This proves that other Greeks from Ionia were united with the Phocaeans. Moreover, that Xenophanes was not the only Colo-

[1] Herodot. i. 170.

[2] Herodot. i. 163–70.

phonian to join the Phocaeans is perhaps shown by the fact that the river beside which Velia was located was given the same name as that of a stream near Colophon, although it is of course possible that the resemblance is only fortuitous.[1] Of more importance is the fact that when confronted with the danger of Persian domination, Xenophanes and the Phocaeans acted in exactly the same manner as, according to Aristotle and Timaeus, did the Colophonians when threatened with an analogous peril at the time of the Lydians. There seems no reason for doubting this latter statement, especially since we learn from Herodotus and other authorities that although the inhabitants of Miletus and Smyrna succeeded in repelling the forces of the Lydian Gyges, Colophon fell into his hands.[2]

Another confirmation of the account of Aristotle and Timaeus is apparently found in the fact that the Ionian-Parian Archilochus visited the region of Siris. Archilochus, as we know, was a contemporary of Gyges, whom he praised on account of his riches.

It has been objected that the Colophonians inhabited an inland city. This is true, but Notium, the port of Colophon, was distant only about nine miles, and Beloch has evidently overlooked the passage in Strabo which states that in the earliest times the Colophonians had a powerful fleet at their disposal.[3] And since there appears no reason for doubting the Colophonian origin of the inhabitants of Siris, it seems probable that the cult and tomb of Calchas at Siris, which the source of Lycophron mentions, refer also to such origin. I have elsewhere treated of the introduction of this Colophonian myth into the Siritis,[4] and would merely note here that the counter-arguments of Beloch are without value. Thus he is wrong in thinking, with Stoll and Immisch, that the Calchas of Daunia (the modern Capitanata) is the Daunian hero Calchus,

[1] The name "Hales" or "Halentus" (from which the form "Cilento" is derived) may perhaps be indigenous. It is the name of a small stream near Francavilla, on the Adriatic coast, at a point not reached by the earliest Greek colonization.

[2] Herodot. i. 14.

[3] Strab. xiv, p. 642 C: *ἐκτήσαντο δέ ποτε καὶ ναυτικὴν ἀξιόλογον δύναμιν Κολοφώνιοι.*

[4] See my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, p. 575; cf. Ciaceri, *op. cit.*, p. 281.

since, as will be seen later (chap. xv below), Calchus was connected with the Daunians of Campania. Moreover, the myth of Calchas, the conqueror of the Lucanians, which Pliny mentions,[1] has nothing to do with the Siritis and with the better-known and larger Lucania, since these Lucanians were the inhabitants of Daunia or Capitanata, while the Lucanians or Leucanians were located in Luceria or Leuceria.

Of even more importance than the myth of Calchas is the fact that at the time of Themistocles, about 480 B. C., the Athenians considered the Siritis as belonging to them and to that Ionian branch of which they had gradually come to regard themselves as the propagators, representatives, and protectors. As Beloch says, it is easy enough to avoid the consideration of any piece of evidence by affirming that it did not arise till a much later period than the one in question, but in such a case the burden of proof always rests upon the one who denies the evidence. The fact that the Athenians sent to Thurii a colony which was in name pan-Hellenic, but in substance Attic, and that this from the very beginning struggled with Tarentum for the possession of the Siritis which lay between them, does not oppose, but rather favors, the assertion of Herodotus that from 480 at least that region was considered the property of the Ionian peoples, of which Athens was regarded as the metropolis. Unless the Ionians had at some early period attempted to seize at least some portion of the Italian coast on the side toward the Ionian Sea, it would not have been possible for such pretensions to be made.

The name of the Ionian Sea may naturally be left out of the question, since etymologically it has nothing to do with the name of the Ionians. Even early writers, such as Theopompus, connected it with an Illyric Ion, and others brought it into relation with a like-named individual of Italian origin.[2] The important fact is that the Ionians were the first to visit the shores of southern Italy for the purposes of commerce and colonization. Starting out

[1] Plin. *N. H.* iii. 104; cf. my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., *loc. cit.*, and my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, p. 303.

[2] Theopomp., fr. 140 M.

from the harbors of Chalcis and Eretria in Euboea, they first established themselves on Ischia and later at Cumae, which latter even by Thucydides is considered the earliest of all the Greek colonies in the West. It does not seem possible, however, that the Euboeans, who had spread along the coast of Sicily and Campania, and had founded Regium and Zancle, did not also possess some commercial settlement on the shore of the Ionian Sea. Ancient writers expressly state that Scylacium—the modern Squillace—on the coast of Bruttium, was of Attic origin; and, even aside from such pretensions, the form of the name is Ionic. It is by no means improbable that, even before the colonization and possession of Scylacium by Croton, Ionian navigators from Euboea had landed both there and at other points on the same coast. There is likewise no reason for doubting the statement that the Euboeans also occupied the coast of Epirus opposite Italy.

The colonization of the Achaean enemies of the Ionians, and also that of the Locrians, Phocaeans, and Tarentines, caused the traces of the Euboean commercial settlements to disappear. This is rendered all the more probable by the fact that, in the beginning at least, the Euboeans seem to have aimed at the possession of commercial landing-places, while other peoples, and especially the Achaeans, sought to secure new and stable possessions, which they made agriculturally prosperous before developing them commercially. It often happened, however, that even the Achaeans were obliged to occupy themselves actively with the interchange of their produce with other regions, and with meeting the competition of the Chalcidian cities commanding the Strait of Messina.

We are therefore not surprised at finding a colony of Colophonians at Siris, in a region later occupied by Achaeans; nor is there anything strange in the statement that a colony of Rhodians existed at Siris, when we remember that the inhabitants of Rhodes and Cos, while on their way to Sicily, may easily have taken occasion to land at some point on the shore of the Ionian Sea, just as, for example, the Spartan Dorieus halted there when on his way to Eryx, and at a later period also the Spartan Cleonymus.[1] It is

[1] Strab. vi, p. 264 C. I have discussed the extension of Rhodian colonization

easy to understand the statement concerning the arrival of the Ionians, when we bear in mind that this occurred in the first half of the seventh century—that is to say, shortly after the founding of the Achaean colonies of Croton and Sybaris. Moreover, the declaration that an Ionic colony existed at Siris is borne out by the reference to the scarcity of Greek colonists on that coast, and by the invitation which, according to Antiochus, was extended by the Achaeans of Sybaris to the other colonists of their nationality to occupy the region where Achaean Metapontum later arose.[1] The opinion that Siris was by origin an Ionic city was universally held in antiquity, which explains why it was accepted by both Lycophron and Trogus Pompeius. Indeed, the epitomizer of the latter alludes clearly to the non-Achaean origin of Siris when he says that it was attacked and besieged by Metapontum, Croton, and Sybaris, these cities having formed an alliance and decided to *pellere ceteros Graecos Italia.* With this statement harmonizes another by the same author, to the effect that in this war the inhabitants of Siris were aided by the Locrians, who thus in their turn drew upon themselves the wrath and attacks of Croton.

From the above, Siris does not seem to have been an Achaean city, in which case it remains to explain why its earliest staters, dating from the second half of the sixth century, bear the well-known legends Σιρῖνος and Πυξόες. The explanation which first suggests itself is that given by the numismatist Head, who supposes that the Achaean cities which attacked Siris forced it to enter into their league.[2] This hypothesis, however, is open to one rather serious objection. From the words of Herodotus mentioned above, and attributed by him to Themistocles about the year 480 B. C., it appears that Siris was to be founded anew by the Athenians, and therefore must have been previously destroyed. In 576 or 572 B. C. Damasus of Siris aspired to the hand of Agarista, daughter of Cleisthenes of Sicyon,[3] and in 511 B. C. Sybaris was destroyed. It

in the West in my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, pp. 569 ff. Here I wish merely to note that the doubts expressed by modern writers are purely hypothetical and not based on specific facts.

[1] Antioch. apud Strab. vi, p. 264 C.

[2] Head, *Hist. num.*, p. 69.

[3] Herodot. i. 127; cf. Busolt, *Griech. Geschichte*, I², p. 666.

therefore seems natural to suppose that the destruction of Siris occurred some time between these two dates, since the downfall of Sybaris must have occurred after the attack made on Siris by the three Achaean cities, Metapontum, Sybaris, and Croton. On the other hand, both the episode of the fifty inhabitants of Siris who were barbarously put to death at the altar of Athena Polias, and the fate which befell the same Siris a few decades after 511 B. C., make it clear that the envy and hatred existing between the various Achaean cities was inextinguishable. The same fact appears from the account of the uprisings which occurred successively in the different Achaean cities against the aristocratic societies of the Pythagoreans.

Two different conclusions may be derived from the above. It may be held that between 572 and 511 Siris was conquered by the Achaeans and transformed into one of their cities, and was later destroyed; or else that the coins bearing Achaean characters belonged to a city which used the alphabet of the neighboring cities, but was of different race. The first hypothesis is not absolutely impossible. After their victories over their foreign enemies the Achaean cities were torn by internal wars with their neighbors. After the war against Siris, Achaean Croton attacked Sybaris, although it too was Achaean. As we learn from the text of Justinus, the Metapontines were the most directly interested in the war with the neighboring Siris, and the material at our disposal offers no real objection to the theory that they had first made Siris their colony, and that this was later overthrown as a result of the jealousy of the neighboring and powerful Achaean cities. Possibly the silence of ancient writers regarding the history of the cities of Magna Graecia is due to the fragmentary condition of our texts, in which we find recorded only a small portion of the events which really occurred; but, at any rate, this silence enjoins the greatest caution in our criticism.

Instead, therefore, of indulging in hypotheses which are easy to sustain and easy to oppose, we prefer to accept the second hypothesis, and ask ourselves how it was possible that an Ionian city, such as Siris seems to have been, should have made use of the Achaean

alphabet on its coins. This phenomenon seems strange enough when considered by itself, but is easily explained when approached from an economic and political, as well as from an epigraphical and numismatical, standpoint.

Siris was an Ionian city, but she was pressed as in a vise between the Achaean cities of Metapontum and Sybaris. In her maritime undertakings she had greater freedom of action, but in her commercial transactions by land she found herself confronted by the indigenous populations, and was compelled to carry on her commerce in that direction with the peoples of the peninsula which had also entered into commercial relations with her neighboring cities. Material and political interests must soon have prevailed over those pertaining merely to race, and when, about 433 B. C., an end was made to the war between Thurii and Tarentum for the possession of the Siritis, it was agreed that those from both cities who so desired might inhabit that region in common. Thus the Siritis became more than ever a border district, instead of a powerful center for independent and national organization. Moreover, it seems very probable that the mixed racial character typical of the Siritis in the fifth century existed also in the sixth and seventh centuries. The account of Amyris of Siris, the father of Damasus and renowned for his wisdom, who was sent to Delphi with an embassy from Sybaris to inquire of Apollo the fate of that city, shows that about 572 B. C., even before Siris and Sybaris had commenced to coin money, there existed the best of relations and probably a political alliance, between the Achaean and the Colophonian city. Unless some such alliance had existed, Siris would never have permitted one of the wisest of her citizens to inquire of the protecting deity of colonies the fate of her neighbor and rival.[1] Moreover, it is only by means of a strict alliance between these two cities that we can explain the perfect resemblance in the types of their coins bearing the figure of a bull looking backward. The resemblance in this case is much greater than that existing between

[1] I combine the account of Athen. xii. 520 *b* with that of Herodot. vi. 127, where it is related that Damasus of Siris, who aspired to the hand of Agarista, was *Ἀμύριος τοῦ σοφοῦ λεγομένου παῖς.*

the coins of Sybaris and those of any other of the cities in the Achaean League.

On the other hand, when we speak of the Achaean, Dorian, and Ionian cities of Magna Graecia and Sicily, we must not think of cities inhabited only by those belonging to the people in question, with no mixture of outside elements. Indeed, the opposite is really the case. Doric elements existed in such Chalcidian colonies as Himera and Zancle-Messana, and even the Sybarites received colonists coming from Troezen. Achaean Croton gave shelter to the Samian Pythagoras, and Achaean colonists were found at Chalcidian Cumae.[1] Moreover, this corresponds with the statement concerning the mingling of races in such Ionian colonies as those in the Cyrenaica. It is, indeed, easy to find similar parallels in the history of colonization of any period.[2]

The existence of an Achaean element in Siris from the sixth century may have favored the coining of money bearing letters which were also Achaean; but it must be admitted that reasons of a commercial nature may at the same time have contributed to this fact. In the second half of the sixth century it is known that the preponderance of the Achaean element, together with a political and commercial understanding between the cities of that nationality, brought about the common system of weights and coinage which tradition attributes to Pythagoras. Such was the importance of this commercial league that even Tarentum, which was not Achaean, but a rival of the Achaean cities, at the very beginning of its coinage (which corresponds chronologically to that of the cities to which it was hostile) accepted, if not the Achaean alphabet, at least the unity of weight.

The desire to reach definite results from the language and alphabets employed on ancient coins may easily lead to error. We know, for example, that the Elymian cities of Sicily were not Greek, and yet Greek legends appear even on the earliest coins of Elymian Segesta. Certainly Rome was not a city of Greek origin, and yet it was counted by the Greeks as a πόλις Ἑλληνίς, and even in its most ancient coinage we find its name written in the Greek alpha-

[1] Cf. Paus. viii. 24. 5. [2] See my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, p. 276.

bet. The same thing is also true for the Samnites of Capua, whose earliest coins display legends which are now Greek and now Oscan.[1]

To give a list of all the Italian cities which made use of other alphabets than would be expected from the nationality of their inhabitants, would require a great deal of space. Before leaving the subject, however, it should be noted that, if we follow the tradition as given by Trogus Pompeius, and judge by the coins bearing the inscriptions ΝΩΛΑΙΟΣ or ΝΩΛΑΙΩΝ, we should say that Nola was a Greek city, just as we should term Greek another of the Campanian cities which has on its coins the letters ΥΓΙΑΝΟΣ and ΥΓΙΕΤΕΝ; by other traditions, on the contrary, we are informed that Nola was a city of the Ausonians, and the coins with the Oscan legends YDINA or AMIDY teach us that this latter city also was not of Greek origin.[2] By way of comparison may also be mentioned the example of Sicily, where one often finds coins of Siculian and Campanian cities bearing Greek inscriptions. Still more to the point is the case of Oenotrian Pandosia, near Croton. The coinage of this city shows the existence of a political alliance with Achaean Croton, and bears Greek inscriptions written in the Achaean alphabet.[3]

Force of circumstances, and political and commercial interests, carried in antiquity, as always, greater weight than racial considerations. Certainly no one would deny the well-confirmed reports concerning the Rhodian origin of Agrigentum and of its founders from Gela, just because in their earliest inscriptions these cities display a preference for the alphabets prevailing in cities of Chalcidian origin. For like reasons of location and political relations,

[1] Καμπάνος and Campanus are derived from Capua. To suppose, as certain critics do, that these coins refer to other Campanian cities is contrary to the teachings of both grammar and history. It is possible, however, that such coins were either made at Naples or were made by Greek artists from that city.

[2] For the coin legends see A. Sambon, *Les monnaies antiques de l'Italie* (Paris, 1904), I, pp. 295 f., 315 f. For Ausonian Nola see Steph. Byz. and Suid., s. v. Whether the statement is really derived from Hecataeus is another question. On the other hand, for Nola as a Chalcidian colony see Iustin. xxii. 1. 13; Sil. Ital. xii. 161. For the Daunian character of Hyria or Urina see chap. xvii, below.

[3] Head, *Hist. num.*, p. 81.

one understands why the Italian Lucanians, when brought into close contact with the Sabine populations of the interior and with the Greeks from the coast, at one time employed on their coins the legend ΛΟΥΚΑΝΟΜ, and at another the Greek ΛΕΥΚΑΝΩΝ, while the neighboring Brettians, although being of indigenous descent, because they came into almost exclusive contact with the Greek cities along the coast which they had conquered, used only coins bearing the Greek legend ΒΡΕΤΤΙΩΝ.

According to Justinus, the Achaean cities of Metapontum, Sybaris, and Croton assailed Siris because she was of different race. It is, however, easy to see that the racial question was subordinate to motives of a far different character. It is true that racial reasons exercised a certain influence in the Peloponnesian war and among the colonists of Magna Graecia; but even Thucydides notes, in connection with the participation of Greeks of various origin in the struggle between the Athenians and Syracusans, that such reasons were overshadowed by others of a very different nature.[1] In like manner, the war of the Metapontines and of the other Achaean cities against Siris was not brought about by hatred of a city of different origin. The participation of Amyris of Siris in an embassy of Sybarites finds a significant parallel in the fact that the Ionian Pythagoras of Samos succeeded for nearly forty years in morally ruling the city of Croton, and later that of Metapontum. The Achaean cities were far from being closed to the influence of other peoples, as is confirmed by the excellent relations which existed between Sybaris and Miletus, commenting on which Herodotus noted that there had never been two cities so closely united by bonds of friendship.[2]

Even if, as the ancient staters of Siris seem to suggest, this Ionic colony had been penetrated by an Achaean element, there is no reason for thinking that the war against the Sybarites was occasioned merely by reasons of *nomen* or race. The true reason for the war, as is also brought out by Beloch, is shown by the staters

[1] Thuc. vii. 57. 1: *οὐ κατὰ δίκην, τι μᾶλλον οὐδὲ κατὰ ξυγγένειαν μετ' ἀλλήλων στάντες ἀλλ' ὡς ἑκάστοις τῆς ξυντυχίας ἢ κατὰ τὸ ξυμφέρον ἢ ἀνάγκη ἔσχεν.*

[2] Herodot. vi. 21.

of Siris, the reverse of which reveals the existence of a political alliance between that city and the city of Pyxus.

Our present information does not enable us to decide whether Pyxus, which later became the Buxentum of the Romans, was an Achaean city, or whether it was founded by Siris; nor are we able to determine whether it was the alliance with this city, as much as that with Sybaris, which led Siris to make use of the Achaean alphabet and monetary standard in the coins which are common to the two cities. We know only that between the years 530 and 510 B. C., which mark chronologically the limit of the period during which such coins were struck, the two cities had entered into an alliance which was very similar to those existing between Croton and Temesa, and between Sybaris and Posidonia. To Lenormant more than to any other writer belongs the credit for bringing out the political importance of such monetary leagues between the Italiot cities situated on the Ionian and Tyrrhenian coasts. From the coins of these places, together with the information derived from ancient writers, it is evident that there existed active commercial rivalry either between the Ionian, Chalcidian, and Achaean cities, or between the Chalcidian and Achaean cities alone. By means of Regium and Zancle the Chalcidians could regulate as they desired the passage of merchandise through the strait, and the only course open to the colonies of other nationalities to secure an outlet for their wares was to traverse the mountains of Bruttium and by means of portages to seek the Tyrrhenian coast. In this way they were enabled to derive profit from the extensive exchange of merchandise which was carried on between Greece and the shores of Campania, Latium, and Etruria, and which was later extended to include Liguria and Iberia after its discovery by the Samians and Phocaeans.

Locri, shut in as it was between Chalcidian Regium and Achaean Croton, solved the problem by passing over the Sila and founding the colonies of Medma and Hipponium. Croton seized Temesa, and the dispute for the possession of that city was the cause of the war between Croton and Locri. Sybaris secured easy communication with the Tyrrhenian side by means of her colonies of Laos and

Scidrus. It was an advantage to have these factories as near as possible to the shores of Campania, Latium, and Etruria, as thus the necessary sea voyage was made much shorter, and the danger of meeting hostile ships was proportionally diminished. Moreover, the greater the advantage obtained by a city located near the regions where trade was carried on, the greater was the commercial loss to the rival situated at a greater distance from such regions. The exceptional commercial prosperity of the Sybarites was in part due to the ease with which they were enabled to transport their wares by land. The colonies of Posidonia and Silarus, near the border of Campania, account very well for the intimate and friendly relations which at the end of the sixth century existed between Sybaris and the Etruscans, who at that time were masters of Campania, and who controlled the valley through which flows the modern Tusciano, which still records their name.[1] That Siris and Metapontum must also have participated in this commerce which rendered prosperous both Sybaris and the Chalcidian cities, requires no demonstration. But, while the valleys to the west of Metapontum merely led among the rough ridges of the Lucanian mountains, the inhabitants of Siris were enabled to ascend the valley of the like-named stream (today the Sinni) and, by passing through the valley where Semuncla was situated, and over the passes to the south of Monte del Papa, to descend toward Pyxus on the opposite coast.[2]

The Sirites accumulated great wealth, and soon shared the reputation of the Sybarites for the effeminacy and luxury of their mode of living. So rich, indeed, did they become that one of their number was able to aspire to the hand of Agarista, the daughter of Cleisthenes, tyrant of Sicyon.[3] It is at present impossible to say whether these riches were derived from commerce by sea, or from cultivating the Italian soil. Certainly the prosperity of Siris must have excited the envy of Metapontum, which, it is true, was mistress of a rich and fertile region, but which was not favorably situated topographically for international and maritime commerce. One

[1] See my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, p. 532. [2] See chap. ii, above.

[3] Herodot. vi. 127; Arist. and Tim. apud Athen. xii. 523 *d*.

also understands how to the hatred of Metapontum and Sybaris was added that of Croton, which was not directly interested in contending with Siris by land, but which could not be on friendly terms with a city which was the ally of its rival Locri on both the Ionian and the Tyrrhenian sides.

The absolute lack of later references to the relations between Locri, Regium, and Siris does not permit us to indulge in further reconstructions. It is, however, possible to throw some light upon the nature of these mutual rivalries and interests by examining briefly the history of Pyxus during the fifth century. From a brief statement in Diodorus, and from a passage in Strabo, we learn that Micythus, the tutor of the sons of Anaxilaus of Regium, founded a colony in that locality in 471 B. C.[1] Pyxus, the ancient ally of Siris, had probably likewise been destroyed not many years before 511 B. C., when Sybaris was overthrown. The intervention of Regium in this district cannot be explained merely by the natural desire of that city to increase the number of her factories along a sea which was being rendered more and more unsafe by the constantly increasing audacity of the Etruscan pirates, against whom Anaxilaus of Regium had already fortified the rock of Scylla. It should, in reality, as I have elsewhere attempted to show, be brought into relation with the alliance which Regium contracted with Tarentum at about this period. Metapontum had been the principal cause of the war which was waged by the Achaean cities against the neighboring Siris, but she enjoyed only for a very short time the hoped-for advantage from the destruction of her rival,[2] and became herself subordinate to the hegemony of Tarentum, her powerful neighbor. For the sake of military security and additional border protection, Tarentum extended her rule to embrace Achaean Metapontum, and even stretched out her hand as far as the Siritis. At that time, however, the war with the Iapygians prevented her from taking part in the busy commercial programme

[1] See chap. ii, above.

[2] Siris is called the daughter of Metapontum (Schol. in Dionys. *Perieg.*, vs. 461), or is even confused with Metapontum (Steph. Byz., s. v. Μεταπόντιον), which may perhaps be explained by supposing that she was conquered by the Metapontines.

of the neighboring cities, and from reaching the Gulf of Pyxus by means of the valleys to the west.

The possession of Pyxus on the part of Regium, together with the alliance with Tarentum, made it possible for the Regians, at least in part, to neutralize the effect of the dangerous commercial competition of Syracuse, which had for some years seriously affected the Chalcidian cities which commanded the strait. To judge from the information which has come down to us, the proposition of Micythus for an alliance between Tarentum and Regium was badly received by the Regians, and the colony which he founded at Pyxus was but short-lived and not very successful. This, however, did not come about through any lack of political shrewdness on the part of the Arcadian Micythus, nor was it owing to the cleverness of the Deinomenid Hiero of Syracuse, who removed from Regium the wise and faithful tutor of the sons of Anaxilaus. The real reason must be sought in the universal change of political conditions. The invasions of the Iapygian Peucetians on the one hand, and of the Etruscans and even Samnites on the other, shook the territorial rule of Magna Graecia to its foundation. The struggle between the Persians and Greeks in the East, and between the Phoenicians of Carthage and the Greeks of Sicily in the West, created other centers of political control. With the exception of Tarentum, nothing remained for the cities of Magna Graecia but to follow in fear and trembling the progress of the Siceliot cities, and especially that of Syracuse, which now aspired to commercial and maritime supremacy over the entire Italian coast.

Fig. 5.—Coin of the Alliance between Siris and Pyxus.

VI

THE HARBOR OF SATYRIUM

Livy, in speaking of the time when M. Livius and the Romans were besieged in the citadel of Tarentum (210 B. C.), and of the aid which was brought them by D. Quinctius, when he set out from Regium with twenty ships and coasted along the shores of Croton and Sybaris (or rather Thurii)[1] says that Democrates, with an equal number of ships of the Tarentines, met this fleet about fifteen miles from the city *ad Sapriportem.* A battle ensued, and of the Roman ships some were sunk, others fled and became the prey of the Metapontines and Thurians, while still others, and among them those carrying the provisions, were carried out to sea by the wind.

So far as I know, no one has as yet succeeded in locating this place *ad Sapriportem.* Weissenborn, for example, states that the place is unknown save for this mention, and adds the useless remark that it should not be confused with the Sacriportus in Latium. For my own part, I suspect that the text is corrupt, and that in place of *ad Sapriportem* we should read some such phrase as *ad Satyri portum.*

In the ancient oracle mentioned by Antiochus in connection with the founding of Tarentum it is said: "I have given you Satyrium and the rich fields of Tarentum for your home."[2] According to other authors, Satyrium was the name of the place where the Spartans founded Tarentum.[3] Nevertheless, from the statements of these writers it is not clear whether Tarentum was founded on the exact spot which was formerly called Satyrium,[4] or whether

[1] Liv. xxvi. 39. 6. Livy here says "Sybaris" in place of "Thurii," just as Varro (*D. R. R.* i. 44. 2) in speaking of the territory of Thurii writes: "in Italia, in Sybaritano."

[2] Antioch. apud Strab. vi, p. 279 C.

[3] Diod. viii. 21; Dion. Hal. xix. 1. 6; Paus. x. 10. 8.

[4] This may be be deduced, for example, from another oracle mentioned by

this name was used of the entire coast where Tarentum arose.[1] In favor of the latter interpretation may be mentioned the circumstance that Coelius Antipater in the fifth book of his annals says that Satyrium was a place near Tarentum, which had received its name from *Satura puella quam Neptunus compressit.*[2] Even today, at a place about twelve miles in a straight line south of Tarentum, there exists on the shore a place termed *Torre di Saturo.* Twelve miles in a straight line corresponds closely enough to the fifteen miles along the coast mentioned by Livy.

Moreover, *Torre di Saturo* is near the place where the above-mentioned naval battle must have occurred.[3] The reason for this is that the harbor of Tarentum and also its approach had been in the hands of the enemy[4] since the time when Hannibal managed to take the ships of the Tarentines across the isthmus. Certain Romans, among them the praetor P. Cornelius, at once boldly attempted to supply the fortress with provisions which they brought by sea,[5] but the Punic fleet which arrived in the following year (211 B. C.) prevented all approach to the citadel from that side.[6] It is true that this fleet departed shortly afterward,[7] but as is shown by the assault of Democrates, the sea was guarded by the Tarentines, and D. Quinctius could hardly have hoped to run the blockade of the port with his relief ships. It was not fifteen miles to the west of Tarentum that he must have encountered the Tarentine fleet, but fifteen miles to the south, since it was in that direction that the Romans were free to act, as is shown by the account of the victory by land which they won soon after.[8] Livy states expressly that Quinctius was not expecting the enemy. Since the

Diod., *loc. cit.:* ἔνθα Τάραντα ποιοῦ ἐπὶ Σατυρίου βεβαῶτα. For the relation between Taras and Satyrium see also my *Storia di Roma,* I, p. 611.

[1] Cf. Dion. Hal. xix. 1. 6.

[2] Coel. Antip. v, p. 35 P.

[3] Cf. Verg. vii. 801. For the archaic Greek vases found at Leporano near the Torre di Saturo see *Notizie degli Scavi,* 1903, p. 33.

[4] Liv. xxv. 11. 5: "post dies classis instructa ac parata (i. e., by the Tarentines) circumvehitur arcem et ante os ipsum portus ancoras iacit." Cf. Polyb. viii 36.

[5] Liv. xxv. 15. 4.

[6] Liv. xxvi. 20. 7.

[7] Liv., *ibid.;* Polyb. ix. 11.

[8] Liv. xxvi. 39. 20.

mouth of the harbor was not free, it seems evident that, after coasting along the territory of Croton and Thurii, instead of keeping on along the shore, he took the sea route leading to *Torre di Saturo*.

We have seen that Coelius Antipater mentioned Satyrium as near Tarentum, in the fifth book of his annals—that is to say, in the work in which he narrated the second Punic war. The fifth book, however, according to the arrangement of the fragments in Peter, instead of referring to events which occurred in 212–210 B. C., had to deal with the period after 208. I see no reason in this case for accepting the order as given by Peter. Fragment 35 might as well be placed before 33 (205 B. C.) and 34. Moreover, fragment 29, which is assigned to the third book, really refers to 208 B. C. The arrangement of Peter hinges on the identification of fragment 30 with Livy's narration of the battle of Sena (207 B. C.) —an identification which even to Peter seems uncertain and to me seems very problematical.

Another fault of the arrangement of Peter is the assignment to book ii alone of the numerous and important events which occurred between the battle of Cannae (216 B. C.) and the march of Hannibal on Rome (211 B. C.), while to books iii, iv, and v are attributed the relatively less important and numerous events between that period and 204 B. C. In the diffuse writings of Livy, six books are given up to the first series of events and three to the second. Coelius was also held to be a voluminous writer,[1] and must have made much the same distribution of his material. According to all probability, book v, as well as books iii and iv, must have been given up to the events which occurred between the battle of Cannae and that of Sena; while the legend of Satyra, beloved of Neptune, and possibly also the parallel myths of Phalanthus and Taras, were set forth by this "embellisher of Roman history"[2] not after 209, when Tarentum was reconquered by Fabius Maximus, but rather where he related the taking of the city by Hannibal in 212, and the subsequent events up to the Roman conquest in 209. From this point of view, Coelius must have acted like, for

[1] Cf. Cic. *Brut.* 26. 102.

[2] Cf. Cic. *De leg.* i. 2. 6.

example, Polybius, who spoke of the history and topography of Tarentum on the occasion of its loss and recapture by the Romans.[1] The difference between Coelius and Polybius in this as in every other portion of their histories lies in the fact that the Greek historian sought occasion to recall the early but authentic history, and furnished useful geographical and topographical references, while the deceitful[2] Roman annalist, in speaking of the same subject, sought to please his readers by recounting the well-known and ancient Greek legends,[3] which Polybius[4] disdained to collect and repeat.[5]

[1] Polyb. viii. 31 ff.; x. i.

[2] Liv. xxviii. 25. 1, 27. 14.

[3] Cf. Cic. *De divin.* i. 29. 9=fr. 71, Peter.

[4] E. g., Polyb. iii. 47.

[5] For Saturum near Tarentum see in addition Serv. ad Verg. *Georg.* ii. 197; *ibid.*, iv. 335.

VII

THURIAE

In 1868 Mommsen[1] published for the first time a bronze caduceus found near Brindisi, on which the following two lines were found:

ΔΑΜΟΞΙΟΝ ΘΟΥΡΙΩΝ
ΜΟΜΙΜΕΔΜΕΡΒ ΜΟΙΜΟΜΑΔ

i. e., *δαμόσιον Θουρίων* and *δαμόσιον Βρενδεσίνων.* The second line is to be read from right to left, and in it the letter Μ has the value of Σ. I shall not here discuss the importance to be attached to this difference in direction of reading the two lines, of which one is in ordinary, and the other in archaic, Greek, as I have already treated of this in my studies on the Iapygians. Following Mommsen, they were published by Kaibel,[2] who concluded that the two inscriptions were incised by order of two different communities, that of the Thurii and that of the Brendesini. Kaibel, however, adds: *ad quodnam tempus hoc illarum civitatum commercium sine foedus pertineat nescio.* It seems to me that the problem may be at least partially solved by reading for the word ΘΟΥΡΙΩΝ, not *Θουρίων*, but *Θουριῶν*,[3] and by recognizing in the name, not the city of Thurii in Campania, as do Mommsen and Kaibel, but rather the Thuriae mentioned by Livy, which, as we learn from that author, was situated not far from Brindisi.

Livy relates for the year 302 B. C. that when the Spartan

[1] See *Hermes*, III (1869), pp. 298 ff.

[2] *Inscript. Graec. Sic. et It.*, No. 672.

[3] It is hardly necessary to note that either form may be read on the caduceus, and that the form *Θουρία*, the name of the fountain where Thurii arose, and also of one of the *πλατεῖαι* of that city (cf. Diod. xii. 10. 6), appears as the name of Thurii on its coins (cf. Garrucci, *op. cit.*, II, Plate CVII, Fig. 7; Thuc. vi. 104; vii. 33), where, as is observed by C. Müller (*Geogr. Graec. Min.*, I, p. 19) *ἡ Θουρία* indicates, not the territory of Thurii, but the city itself. In like manner probably the *ἡ Θουρία* in Strab. vi, p. 280 C., indicates the city and not the surrounding territory.

Cleonymus arrived on the coast of Italy, *Thurias urbem in Sallentinis cepit*, but that when the consul Aemilius arrived on the spot, he fled, and *Thuriae redditae veteri cultori, Sallentinoque agro pax parta.* In other annals, however, Livy states that the dictator Iunius Bubulcus was sent to the country of the Sallentines, and that Cleonymus departed without contending with him. He adds that Cleonymus sailed around the promontory of Brundisium, and was carried by the winds into the midst of the Adriatic, with the coast of Italy on his left and that of Illyricum on his right, and that having traversed the Adriatic, he finally arrived at Patavium, the native town of Livy, who for this reason made his digression. Livy then goes on to say that in the temple of Juno at Patavium were preserved the rostra of the ships, spoils of the victory obtained over Cleonymus and his Laconian followers.[1]

It now remains to discover the location of this Thuriae which Livy mentions. Certainly it was not at the extremity of the Sallentine peninsula, since, aside from the fact that Livy uses the word *Sallentini* to indicate generically the inhabitants of the region in the neighborhood of Tarentum,[2] it is not probable that the Romans at the time in question could have pressed as far as that region. The Romans were then allies of the Lucanians, and it seems natural to admit that Thuriae was situated in Peucetia.[3] From the account in Livy, however, it appears to have been near Brindisi, but to the south of that city and on the Sallentine peninsula; otherwise Livy could not have stated that Cleonymus, when

[1] Liv. x. 2.

[2] It is true that Livy (ix. 43) says for the year 307: "cum . . . . Sallentini hostes decernerentur," but, as has been noted above, the term "Sallentini" is also used by him to indicate the region situated in general in the neighborhood of Tarentum (xxv. 1) and Brindisi (xxiii. 48. 3; cf. xxiv. 20 16). Thus Livy employs the name "Calabria" to indicate, not the northern part of that peninsula, but rather the southern portion, where, as we know from other writers, the Sallentini lived (cf. xlii 48. 7). In the same manner Plin. *N. H.* ii. 240 records the "in Sallentino oppido Egnatia," which was really in Peucetia.

[3] Diod. xx. 104 (303 B. C.) states: *κατὰ δὲ τὴν Ἰταλίαν Ταραντῖνοι πόλεμον ἔχοντες πρὸς Λευκανοὺς καὶ Ῥωμαίους*, in connection with the summoning of Cleonymus by the Tarentines. Possibly the statement (Pseud.-Arist. *De Mir. Ausc.* 78 [75]) referring to the Peucetian Aulus who tried to poison Cleonymus alludes to relations between that leader and Peucetia.

after the capture of Thurii he proceeded northward in the Adriatic, had on his left the coast of Italy and on his right that of Illyricum, after he had passed beyond the promontory of Brindisi.

It seems, however, that in this detail Livy should be corrected by Diodorus, who, after speaking of the deeds of Cleonymus, and stating that he came from Corcyra, where he had received notice of the rebellion of the Tarentines, and arrived in Italy in a region inhabited by barbarians (the Sallentini of Livy), narrates that Cleonymus seized a city (our Thuriae), laying waste its territory, and afterward captured a fortress called Triopium (*τὸ καλούμενον Τριόπιον*), taking three thousand prisoners. There then followed a nocturnal incursion on the part of the barbarians of that region—whom Diodorus does not expressly name, but who were the Sallentini of Livy, the allies of Rome—who killed over two hundred of his men and made about a thousand prisoners. In addition to this disaster, there came up a tempest which destroyed twenty ships along the shore where Cleonymus was encamped. Overcome by such misfortune, Cleonymus returned with his army to Corcyra.[1]

Taken as a whole, these accounts agree with those of Livy. Diodorus, however, differs from Livy in that he makes Cleonymus return to Corcyra, and not go at once toward the northern part of the Adriatic. It would seem that in this he must be right. Livy passes over in silence the relations existing between Cleonymus and Tarentum, which were nevertheless of great importance for the history of Rome in her dealings with that city. He alludes briefly to the achievements of Cleonymus among the Sallentini, but speaks at great length of what he accomplished at Patavium. Diodorus, on the other hand, who was under the guidance of Greek sources in relating these events, and who has the point of view of a compiler of universal history as conceived by a Greek, treats with much more detail of the relations of Cleonymus with Tarentum and the barbarians of that region. If he does not take the trouble to tell us that the Romans were among the barbarians who harassed the Spartan leader, we must not accuse him of negligence. For the earliest period of Roman his-

[1] Diod. xx. 104 ff.

tory his references to that people are dry and meager in the extreme, and, as every student knows, this adds not a little to their value. Moreover, he had shortly before asserted that the Tarentines summoned Cleonymus to their aid against the Lucanians and Romans. Cleonymus had seized Corcyra before coming to Italy, and had left a garrison on that island.[1] After losing in Italy a considerable portion of his followers and fleet, he naturally wished to return to Corcyra before undertaking an expedition along the Adriatic shores.

This fruitless wandering of Cleonymus along the entire Adriatic coast as far as the country of the Veneti—*nulla regione maris Hadriatici pros pere adita*, as Livy says—cannot be explained as the work of a man who, having become master of Corcyra, was unwilling, as we learn from Diodorus, to enter into an alliance with either Cassander or Demetrius, because he aspired to obtain control of a more extensive Greek country.[2] The fact is that Corcyra had been taken from him.[3] We learn from Diodorus[4] that two years after these events (300 B. C.) the Corcyrans were besieged by Cassander. This means that before 300 they had been freed from the tyranny of Cleonymus, who, having lost this rich city, and having been repudiated by the Tarentines and become the enemy of the Lucanians and of Agathocles of Syracuse, had nothing better in view than to attempt to secure a territory among the barbarian inhabitants of the Adriatic.

Accepting (as I accept) the statement of Diodorus regarding the departure of Cleonymus from Italy toward Corcyra, it does not seem that the Thuriae of Livy could have been located south of Brindisi, although there is no way of determining precisely from this reference just where the city lay, since we have no other mention of the Triopium to which Diodorus refers. In the *Tabula Peutingeriana* there is mention of a locality on the Adriatic coast to the south of Brindisi and Bari, termed *Turenum*, and cor-

[1] Diod. xx. 105.

[2] Diod. xx. 104: διανοούμενος ὁρμητηρίῳ τούτῳ τῷ τόπῳ χρήσασθαι [i. e., of Corcyra] καὶ τοῖς περὶ τὴν Ἑλλάδα πράγμασιν ἐφεδρεύειν.

[3] Pomp. Trog. *Prol.* 15.

[4] Diod. xxi. 2. 1.

responding to the modern Trani. We know from Livy that Thuriae was situated in the neighborhood of Brindisi, and there is a possibility that it should be looked for in the form *Turenum*.[1] The probabilities, however, are in favor of locating it, not to the south, but to the north, of Brindisi, in the direction of the neighboring Peucetia. This is made likely, among other things, by the friendly relations existing at that time between the Lucanians, who had pushed along the coast in that region, and the Romans. In the caduceus I see a further confirmation of the account of Livy, and it seems much more probable that the city which was an ally of Brindisi—it was for this reason that they had the caduceus in common—should have been situated in the neighborhood, rather than in distant Lucania. For this reason there seems to attach little value to the corrections of the text of Livy to Rudiae or Uria, as some writers have suggested.[2]

I am far from thinking that the resemblance between Thuriae and Thurii is entirely accidental. Even a superficial examination of the coinage of the Apulian cities shows many points of contact with those of Tarentum, Metapontum, and, above all, Tarentine-Thurian Heraclea.[3] To this should be added that in Peucetia are found certain coins which are generally, and it seems correctly, assigned to Grumum near Bari. These coins have on the reverse a figure of a bull exactly similar to that on the coins from Thurii, and were struck about 300 B. C. It has been suggested by Minervini that they belonged to some colony of Thurii.[4] In the same

[1] The ancient form "Thuriae" could bear the same relation to the modern "Turiae" that the "Thagines" of Calabria in Plin. *N. H.* iii. 96 does to the "Tacina" of the itinerary of Auborius, 114.

[2] See, e. g., Weissenborn, *ad loc.;* Mommsen, *Röm. Geschichte*, I[6], p. 374.

[3] It is useless to dwell longer upon so well-known and self-evident a fact. It should merely be noted that the coin which Imhoof-Blumer (*Monnaies grecques* [Amsterdam, 1882], p. 12, Plate I, Fig. 14) rightly attributes to Apulian Herdoniae, and which closely resembles the monetary type of Metapontum, is connected with the fact, as this author has pointed out, that Hannibal, when he destroyed that city, sent its inhabitants to Metapontum and Thurii (Liv. xxvii. 1. 14).

[4] Garrucci, *op. cit.*, II, p. 114, Plate XCV, Figs. 40, 41. Minervini (*ibid.*) referred them to Grumentum in Lucania. Head, *Hist. num.*, p. 39, also refers them to the Grumbestini of Peucetia (cf. Plin. *N. H.* iii. 105).

manner, a coin from Thurii struck about the beginning of the third century shows such resemblance to one from Caelia as to authorize the hypothesis that this Peucetian city in the neighborhood of Grumum, which as a rule imitated the types of Heraclea, in this case copied the Thurian example.[1]

During the fifth century Thurii exercised a certain influence in Campania, and it seems that the above data would justify us in asking whether she did not seek an outlet for her commercial activity in Apulia also. If the Thuriae near Brindisi was really a colony of Thurii, it is not difficult to discover the motive which led to so close an alliance.

Polybius tells us that "from the Iapygian promontory as far as Sipontum, whoever sailed toward Italy from the opposite shores landed at Tarentum," and adds that at that time "the city of Brindisi had not as yet been founded."[2] Tarentum was probably no older than Brindisi, but her jealousy prevented the rival city from becoming a commercial emporium. On the other hand, it is known that Tarentum did not regard the growth of Thurii favorably. The new city was hardly founded before it found itself implicated in a war with Tarentum for the Siritis,[3] and about 282 B. C., when the Romans came to the aid of Thurii which was besieged by the Lucanians, the two cities were bitter enemies.[4] Admitting that at the end of the fourth century Thurii had founded on the coast of Apulia a colony having the same name,[5] we understand why this

[1] Garrucci, *op. cit.*, II, Pl. XCV, Fig. 29; cf. Plate CVII, Fig. 15.

[2] Polyb. x. 1; cf. Mommsen, *CIL*, IX, p. 8.

[3] Diod. xii. 23, for the year 444 B. C.

[4] App. *Samn.* 7.

[5] That a Greek city should found a colony having the same name is not common, but is not without examples. We are thus reminded of the two Megaras, of Euboea in Sicily, of Piraeus, the Athenian colony in the Pontus, etc.

Corcia, in his *Storia di Napoli*, III, p. 493, says that the Thuriae of Livy should be sought in the modern Turi near Conversano, and that we should naturally expect to find it near Caeliae and Grumum. It seems evident from the account in Livy and Diodorus, however, that it was a maritime city. Much more valuable is his opinion that in the Tutini of Mediterranean Calabria (Plin. *N. H.* iii. 105) we should recognize the Thurini. In this case we should be led rather toward Brindisi than toward Bari. The fact that Pliny enumerates the Tutini (or Thurini) among the Mediterranean peoples does not detract from the value of these observations

colony should have entered into an alliance with Brindisi. Both were inspired by the same hatred of Tarentum, and it was not possible for them to prosper until after the downfall of their rival, and the victory of the Romans.

since Pliny often makes mistakes of this nature. Thus among the Mediterranean peoples of Apulia he mentions the Irini (or Hirini), the well-known inhabitants of the maritime Hyrium on the slopes of Mount Garganus; the Dirini, who inhabited the site of the modern Monopoli on the coast (see Guid. 27, p. 467, Parthey; cf. *An. Rav.* iv. 31. 7; v. 1. 2); and the Veretini of the Sallentine peninsula. Pliny likewise errs in attributing to Calabria, or the northern portion of the Sallentine peninsula, the Butuntinenses and Grumbestini, who in reality belonged in Peucetia. He may therefore have been deceived in regard to the Tutini or Thurini.

VIII

THE EXPEDITION OF ALEXANDER OF EPIRUS TO ITALY

One of the obscure points in the chronology and political history of Rome and Magna Graecia is the account of the deeds of Alexander of Epirus, the prince who aimed at forming a vast state in southern Italy at the same time that his nephew, Alexander the Great, was assailing the Persian empire.

The references regarding this are very scanty. The history of the relations between the Molossian leader and the Tarentine state received very slight mention from the Romans, who in writing their own history made little of the resistance of the peoples they conquered, and narrated merely the facts which served to bring out their own glory. Moreover, practically everything in this narration is a subject of dispute, from the year of the arrival of Alexander in Italy to that of his death, and from the fundamental characteristics of his undertaking to the list of the conquered cities. It is not even clear from what source is derived the dramatic account of the death of this leader, which is preserved in Livy,[1] and as has often been observed, the statements concerning the year of his arrival and that of his death are erroneous. Livy says that he came to Italy in 341 B. C., while from other data of contemporary authors it appears that he could not have arrived before 336, the year in which he married Cleopatra. Livy also says that he died in 327, and erroneously assigns to that year the founding of Alexandria. From writers of the period, however, it is determined that his death occurred about 330.[2]

[1] Liv. viii. 3, 17, 24; cf. Iust. xii. 2. 12; Strab. vi, pp. 256, 280 C.

[2] For his marriage to Cleopatra in 336 see Diod. xvi. 91. He was, however, in Italy by the summer of 333 B. C. (see Arrian. iii. 6. 7) and before November (see Arrian. ii. 11; iii. 6). Aeschines (*In Ctesiph.* 242) mentions his death as if it were a recent event in 330 (cf. Iust. xii. 1. 4. 31). The statement of Livy (viii. 24. 7) concerning the continual rains leads one to think of the late autumn of 331 or the

Some have attributed these errors to a mistake on the part of Livy in calculating the Olympiads; others have sought to justify the dates given by referring them to the date established for the foundation of Rome by the other annalists who did not follow the era of Cato or of Varro. A third, and possibly better course is followed by those who find in this portion of Livy one of those numerous chronological duplications, as a result of which, for example, the same war with the Volscians was twice narrated, once at Satricum and once at Privernum, and the taking of Teanum Apulum was twice mentioned. It is even possible that Livy, when he alludes to the deeds of Alexander in narrating the wars waged by the Romans against Naples, may have followed one of the many processes of concentration of which he, as well as all other early historians, has been guilty.[1]

There still remains another possible explanation. Since Livy states that Alexander remained fourteen years in Italy, although he was there in reality but five or six, it may be that he committed the error of attributing to Alexander of Epirus alone what had been accomplished both by him and by Archidamus of Sparta, who came to Italy to aid the Tarentines at about the time when Livy supposes that Alexander was summoned by them. This assumption, which at first sight may appear rather bold, is supported by the fact that Pliny really confuses these two individuals, and refers to Theopompus as his authority. He affirms that Alexander died at Mandonium, although it is known that he expired at Pandosia in Bruttium, and that it was Archidamus of Sparta who died at Mandonium or Manduria.[2]

winter of 330 B. C. The real date of the arrival of Alexander escaped Niese (*Geschichte d. griech. u makedon. Staaten*, I, p. 476), but is exactly established by Beloch (*Griech. Geschichte*, II, p. 596).

[1] See my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, p. 375.

[2] Archidamus did not arrive in Italy earlier than 343 B. C. (cf. Schäfer, *Demosthenes u. seine Zeit*, II², p. 364), and died there in August, 338 B. C. (cf. Diod. xvi. 88). Pliny (*N. H.* iii. 98), referring to Theopompus as his authority, says that Alexander died at *Mandonia Lucanorum* in 338 B. C. (Diod., *loc. cit.*). From Plutarch (*Agis*. 3) we learn that Archidamus was killed at Μανδόνιον τῆς Ἰταλίας ὑπὸ Μεσσαπίων. In my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, p. 545, I proposed the identification of this Mandonium with the Manduria on the Sallentine penin-

I shall pass over the other chronological and topographical problems connected with the expedition of Alexander. Elsewhere I have shown that the hypothesis of certain Calabrian writers, who think that he died at Acri in the valley of the Mucrone, is due to an erroneous reading of the text of Livy, also wrongly accepted by Lenormant and Head. From this passage we cannot with certainty derive the mention of Terina, as critics generally do. It should also be noted in this connection that in the modern texts of Livy the word *Consentia*, which is lacking in the Medicean codex, should be struck out from the passage referring to the first victories of Alexander. The only place where Livy could have mentioned this city would be in connection with Alexander's death.[1]

The few words with which Livy alludes to the career of this leader are both compressed and confused, and the text in the codices is corrupt and possibly mutilated. The accounts of Justin are better arranged, but even they are open to doubt. It is, therefore, hard to understand how modern writers who have treated the subject could so readily have accepted such inadequate proof for their statements.[2] A careful examination of the texts in question leads to conclusions somewhat at variance with those which are generally accepted.

sula which was taken by Q. Fabius in 209 (Liv. xxvii. 15), and which is also mentioned by Pliny (*N. H.* ii. 226). Beloch (*Griech. Gesch.*, II, p. 593, n. 1) does not admit this identification and says that Archidamus was killed at some place unknown to us, "apparently far inland," and distinguishes Mandonia from Manduria. He overlooks the fact that, according to Plutarch (*loc. cit.*), Archidamus was killed by Messapians, and there is nothing to prevent us from assuming that he died at Manduria, which was near a lake on the Sallentine peninsula (Plin. *N. H.* ii. 226). Moreover, Manduria is termed Μανδύριον by Stephen of Byzantium, s. v.

[1] Liv. viii. 24. 4: "cum saepe Bruttias Lucanasque legiones fudisset, Heracleam Tarentinorum coloniam [Consentiam] ex Lucanis Sipontum Bruttiorum acrentinam alias inde Messapiorum ac Lucanorum cepisset urbes." The word *consentiam* is not in the Medicean codex. In place of the *acrentinam* of this codex, others have *acerinam*. From a suggestion of Sigonius, our texts now read *ac Terinam*, and to Cluver is due the placing of *Consentiam* after *Bruttiorum*. The word *Apulorum* after *Sipontum*, and *Potentiam* before *ex Lucanis*, are late and arbitrary additions, unfortunately accepted even by Weissenborn (see my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, pp. 489–91).

[2] This corrupt text of Liv. viii. 24. 4 is accepted without comment by Beloch (*op. cit.*, II, p. 594), and the various traditions are noted, also without criticism, by Niese (*loc. cit.*).

The purpose of Alexander is well known. He was summoned by the Tarentines, and arrived in Italy two or three years after Archidamus, the Spartan, had perished at Manduria in a battle with the Lucanians and Messapians (338 B. C.). The Epirote prince took charge of reorganizing the military forces of Tarentum; of causing her ancient hegemony to be recognized among the Messapians; and, above all, of protecting her against the frequent invasions of the Lucanians. Only for a brief period at the time of Archytas and the second Dionysius had the Tarentines been able to defend themselves even partially by their own arms. When the supremacy of the two Dionysii of Syracuse along the Adriatic coast had come to an end, there followed a long period during which Tarentum, more or less unwillingly, had to give herself into the power of foreign soldiers of fortune, to guard against the Lucanian invasions. Alexander succeeded Archidamus after only a short interval, and was himself followed with equal rapidity by Agathocles, Cleonymus of Sparta, and Pyrrhus. Adapting himself to the position of commander of the forces of a friendly city, he concealed, as did his successors, his larger plans of personal dominion. He pretended at first to assail the enemies of Tarentum, just as the condottieri of the fifteenth century entered the service of the Italian cities for the purpose of procuring a larger state for themselves. According to Justin, he commenced by attacking Brundisium, the rival *par excellence* of Tarentum. Like the latter city, Brundisium had an excellent harbor, but her position opposite Epirus drew away from her enemy a large portion of the commerce of the East.[1] We may also put faith in the statement of Livy that Sipontum was one of Alexander's first conquests.[2] In addition, he is said to have subdued a considerable portion of Apulia. This is not contradicted by the circumstance that he thought it best to make peace with Brundisium. According to Trogus Pompeius, he was led to do this by reverence for the oracles. It is clear that in this case religion served as a cloak for lack of success or for some political design. It is also said that Alexander formed an alliance with the Apulians and Peucetians, the indigenous inhabitants who domi-

[1] Iust. xii. 2. 7. [2] Liv. viii. 24. 4.

nated the *Colline delle Murge*, and kept at bay the Apulians of the coast.[1] Since Alexander was aiming less at aiding the Tarentines than at the formation of a vast principality, it is clear why he preferred to make treaties with their enemies, and to favor the maritime relations with his native Epirus. The alliance with Brundisium was possibly paralleled by others with Rubi, Salapia, and Apulian cities, to judge from the types of their coins.[2]

The fact that Alexander fought entirely in his own interest, and aimed at forming a vast principality, is shown by the statement regarding the Lucanian exiles who formed, so to speak, his praetorian guard, and by the reference to the three hundred prominent indigenous families which he sent as hostages to Epirus.[3]

Tarentum finally became aware that in place of a protector she had secured a master, and the democracy of that city, given as it was to an easy and luxurious manner of living, became intolerant of discipline and military supremacy, and came into open rupture with Alexander and later with all of his followers. It would seem that the Tarentines sought to counterbalance the alliance of Alexander with the Messapians by making peace in their turn with the Lucanians, the ones among their common enemies who had offered the longest and most obstinate resistance. Alexander, in order to break off all relations with the Tarentines who had summoned him, allied himself with Thurii, conquered Heraclea on the Siris, where under the Tarentine hegemony the parliament of all the Italiot cities assembled, and transferred the seat of the common council to the territory of Thurii on the banks of the river Acalandrus.[4] With this must naturally be related the alliance of Alexander with Metapontum, which during the periods in which Tarentum was especially flourishing had to recognize the supremacy of her more powerful neighbor.[5]

In a ancient source it is said that Alexander, on setting sail for

[1] Iust. xii. 2. 7, 12.

[2] The resemblance between the types of coins from Epirus and those from certain Apulian cities may, however, be connected with relations existing for a longer period between the two countries situated on opposite shores of the Adriatic.

[3] Liv. viii. 24. 5. [4] Strab. vi, p. 280 C. [5] Iust. xii. 2. 12.

Italy, exclaimed that his nephew, the great Macedonian, was fighting with women, while he, in taking the field against the Romans, was preparing to attack men.[1] If these words were really pronounced on that occasion, they would indicate that the problem of Roman domination in the southern part of the peninsula was clearly present in the minds of Greek politicians as early as the middle of the fourth century. There seems to me no reason for discrediting this statement, nor for doubting, as did certain ancient writers (and as do many critics of the present day) the embassy of the Romans to Alexander the Great. The treaty between the Romans and the Samnites, and also that between the Romans and the Carthaginians, which fall in about the same period, between 351 and 348 B. C., together with the Roman intervention in Campania, about 340, and the conquest of Naples, about 326, all clearly show that after 356, and after her victories over the Gauls, and over the Etruscans of Tarquinii, Rome had become the most powerful state of central Italy. The formation of this state naturally preoccupied both the Italiots and the rulers of Greece proper, who after the political downfall of Greece sought their fortune in the West. It may well be that, before moving against the Romans, Alexander the Molossian tried to form a state in Apulia, and later a league of all the Italiot cities, to serve him as a base of operations. At any rate, the rupture with Tarentum forced him to renounce his intention of forming a realm of his own in the portion of southern Italy lying toward the Adriatic, and to turn his arms against the Lucanians and the Calabrian states.

Alexander allied himself with Achaean Metapontum and with Achaean Attic Thurii, both enemies of Tarentum.[2] At this point we should expect mention of Croton, Locri, Regium, and the other Greek cities of Bruttium which from about the year 356 B. C. had been in the hands of the Brettii. If the passage from Livy quoted above does allude to the capture of Terina, it would show that Alexander seized this entire region. This result is also arrived at by a study of the coins of Hipponium, which was likewise captured about 356 by the Brettii. Of these coins, some record the cult of

[1] Gell. *N. A.* xvii. 21. 33.

[2] Iust. xii. 2. 12.

Olympian Zeus, and are attributed to the time of Alexander.[1] From the scanty information which has come down to us regarding this period, it would seem that the cities of Bruttium were torn by continual intestine strife, caused by the opposition of the Greek element to the conquering Brettii.[2] This was certainly the case with Croton, both for the time immediately following the death of Alexander and for the succeeding period.[3] According to the same passage from Diodorus,[4] Thurii also is said to have been taken by the Brettii after 356. If, however, we find that she became the stronghold and favorite city of Alexander, this shows that the Greek element had there succeeded in obtaining the upper hand, even though, as the coins seem to show, it was continually deteriorating.[5] The alliance of Alexander with Thurii and Metapontum, and the exclusion of Tarentum from the Achaean and Italiot league into which she had forced herself at the time of the wars for the territory of Siris, would have formed the turning-point of the political ideals of the Italiots of the fifth century. But their horizon was then changed. The Lucanians and Brettians were closing in upon the cities of the coast, and had even seized some of them. It was necessary to rise to the higher ideal of a Greek empire in southern Italy, to be attained by recognizing all of Bruttium and Lucania, which had formerly been held by the Oenotrians. The dominion of a general who could command both the natives and the Greeks would naturally succeed to, and absorb, the single cities and small confederations.

By marching through the territory of Metapontum and the valley of the Brasento, Alexander would have been able to traverse the entire district controlled by the Lucanians, and to strike at the very heart of the empire belonging to the most vigorous of his enemies in the south. In fact, it is affirmed by a well-known modern historian that he did make his way through this region, and push as far as Paestum.[6] This assumption, however, rests

[1] Head, *Hist. num.*, p. 85.

[2] Diod. xvi. 15. 2.

[3] Diod. xix. 4. 10; xxi. 4; cf. Liv. xix. 3. 12; and my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, p. 482.

[4] Diod. xvi. 15. 2.

[5] Head, *Hist. num.*, p. 72.

[6] Beloch, *Griech. Gesch.*, II, p. 594.

upon a simple equivocation, or rather upon a false interpretation of a passage in Livy. From Livy, and also from the historian Lycus of Regium, whose account of this event has hitherto been overlooked, we learn that Alexander coasted around Calabria, and approached Paestum by sea.[1] This shows that he did not have sufficient forces at his disposal to enable him successfully to traverse the Lucanian territory. Moreover, it is probable that, after having fought for several years against the Lucanians, whom he had learned to honor and fear, he had noticed that they were continually being reinforced by allies from the north.[2] He therefore planned to surprise the enemy by a flank movement, just as Julius Caesar did when, in proceeding against the Britons, he sought to prevent their sending reinforcements to the Celts in Gaul. The Lucanians were in reality allies of the Samnites, from whom they were descended. The Samnites were at war with the Romans. Alexander, as protector of the Italiot cities, had already had occasion to complain of the piracy of the Volscians of Antium, who shortly before had become subject to Rome,[3] and ably guarded his own interests by allying himself with Rome against the Samnites. The Samnites were for a short period restrained from occupying the regions for which they were contending with the Romans, and, having hastened to the aid of the Lucanians, were defeated with them by Alexander near the plain of Paestum.

[1] Liv. viii, 17: "ceterum Samnites bellum Alexandri Epirensis in Lucanos traxit, qui duo populi adversus regem *escensionem* a Paesto facientem signis conlatis pugnaverunt. eo certamine superior Alexander, incertum, qua fide culturus, si perinde cetera processissent, pacem cum Romanis fecit." Lyc. apud Steph. Byz., s. v.: Σκίδρος πόλις Ἰταλίας. τὸ ἐθνικὸν Σκιδρῖνος, ὡς Λύκος ἐν τῷ περὶ Ἀλεξάνδρου. This passage settles the question, raised by certain critics (e. g., Bouché-Leclercq, *Hist. des Lagides*, I, p. 135), as to whether Lycus related the deeds of Alexander the Great or of the Molossian. It is generally admitted that Scidrus must have been located on the Tyrrhenian coast not far from Laos, and here, just as in Laos, the Sybarites must have taken refuge (Herodot. vi. 25). Possibly it occupied the site of the modern Sapri (cf. Nissen, *Ital. Landeskunde*, II, p. 898).

[2] Compare Liv. viii. 24. 4, "cum saepe Bruttias Lucanasque legiones fudisset," with Iust. xii. 2. 13: "sed Bruttii Lucanique cum auxilia a finitimis contraxissent, acrius bellum repetivere." After these words follows the account of the last battle at the Acheron.

[3] Strab. v, p. 231 C.

Ancient writers have discussed the problem as to whether after this war Alexander would have kept faith with the Romans. There is, however, little use in wasting time over problems such as this, concerning what might have occurred had human events followed a different course.

In addition to the Romans, we expect to find some reference to the Campanians, and there can be no doubt that Alexander had relations with such close neighbors of Paestum. It is evident, however, that our accounts of these events accept the version according to which the Campanians had of their own accord subjected themselves to Rome, a few years before the arrival of Alexander. In reality the Campanians preserved their autonomy until the time of Pyrrhus, and in part even to the time of Hannibal.[1]

The existence of an autonomous state at Capua possibly explains the Campanian coins with Oscan legends, and with the same type of Jupiter Olympus and the eagle which exists on the coins of the Bruttian Hipponium or Vibo, which have been correctly connected with Alexander of Epirus.[2] Of the two confederate states of Latium and Campania, the former certainly possessed the preponderating influence. Thus Alexander, in allying himself with the Campanians, could not disregard the Romans, who were masters of the most powerful state in Italy, and who prevented free access to the regions north of the peninsula of Sorrento. He therefore limited himself to the conquest of the Italy of the Greeks, and, instead of going north to contend with the Samnites in the heart of their own territory, descended toward the south to attack the flying Lucanians from the rear, thus traversing the valley of the Tanagrus. This is the valley which was later chosen by Alaric, to whom it proved equally fatal.

By this march Alexander aimed at conquering the entire *Hinterland* of his ally Thurii, and at penetrating to the valley of the Crathis, where Pandosia, the ancient capital of the Oenotrian kings was located. At first he succeeded in making good progress. The

[1] See my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, pp. 229, 255.

[2] Garrucci, *Mon. d. It. Ant.*, Plate 116, Fig. 13=Head, *Hist. num.*, p. 85; cf. Garrucci, Plate 96, Fig, 33; Plate 97, Fig. 16.

Lucanians, however, driven by necessity, united with their ancient subjects, the Brettians of Calabria, who were a cross between the earliest Italic peoples, formerly the slaves of the Italiots, and their future conquerors, the Lucanians. Leading a proud and savage life, the Brettians had shaken off the yoke of the Lucanians and united in a powerful confederation. They aimed at subjugating all of the rich Italiot cities on the Ionian and Tyrrhenian coasts. Alexander presented himself as the liberator of the Italiots, and as the founder of a single and compact empire in southern Italy, which naturally forced the Bruttians to make common cause with their neighbors. Alexander approached the walls of Pandosia, the ancient capital of the Oenotrian kings, and there, close to the banks of the Acheron, the dart of a Lucanian exile put an end to his life. When he heard the fatal name of the river which he had avoided in his native Epirus, he must have felt the same dejection as did Ezzelino da Romano when he found himself before the very Cassano which he had tried to avoid.[1]

The joy of the Tarentines at the tragic death of Alexander was but short-lived. Incapable of defending themselves, by various wiles, they had recourse, in quick succession, to the arms of the Gauls, the Umbrians, and the Samnites, and later to those of Pyrrhus. On the other hand, the faithful friends of Alexander from Thurii and Metapontum felt great sorrow at his death, and paid the last honors to his mutilated remains.[2] With him vanished their last hope of constituting, as at the time of the ancient Achaean League, a state which would enable them to escape, not only the yoke of the Lucanians and the Bruttians, but also the hegemony of Tarentum.

It is not correct to assert, as has been done, that with the death of the brave Epirote leader there disappeared a great Greek principality, extending from Garganus to Metapontum, and from

[1] An analogous account refers to Lysander, whom an oracle is said to have warned to "shun loud Oplites," and who met his death near the river "Oplites" (Plut. *Lys.* 29. 7). A similar legend relates to Hannibal. It was prophesied that he would be buried in Libyssan soil, and he met his death, not in his native Libya, but at Libyssa in Bithynia (cf. Plut. *Han.* 20).

[2] Iust. xii. 2. 15; Liv. vii. 24. 16; Strab. vi, p. 256 C.; Suid., s. v. *τόνος*.

Regium to Paestum and the banks of the Silarus. There is nothing to suggest that, when Alexander turned toward the west, his Apulian empire had not already been dismembered and assailed by the Lucanians and Tarentines. The battle at the Silarus, the limit reached by his conquests, leads to the supposition that he aimed at bringing under his control all of the *ἀρχαία Ἰταλία* of the Italiots between Posidonia (Paestum) and the borders of the Tarentines and Iapygians, and that he sought compensation on the Ionian and Tyrrhenian shores for the ephemeral empire which he had formed on the Adriatic coast.

In other words, Alexander, confronted with the invasion of the Lucanians and Brettians, and of the Romans who had almost secured control of Campania, conceived a plan not dissimilar to that of the Corinthian Timoleon, who, having arrived in Sicily a few years earlier, had succeeded in bringing a portion of the Siceliot cities under the control of Syracuse. It is true that Timoleon was favored by the still existant traces of the great political and commercial prosperity of Syracuse—a prosperity such as no Italiot city ever attained. He gathered the last fruits of a sounder and more extended political organization than ever existed in southern Italy. Moreover, in Sicily the enemy could be easily watched. On the other hand, the *ver italicum* which was urging the new generations onward to the possession of southern Italy, made it easy to foretell that the domination of the peninsula could no longer remain with the Italiots, incapable as they were of defending themselves and having recourse to soldiers of fortune for aid. It was clear, too, that southern Italy could not become a possession of the fierce and uncivilized Celts of the Po valley. Such a destiny was reserved for the peoples of central Italy, which to their freshness of physical vigor added the advantage of knowing how to utilize the gifts of the Greek and Punic civilizations. Cleandridas, the father of Gylippus, Archidamus of Sparta, Alexander of Epirus, Agathocles, Cleonymus of Sparta, and Pyrrhus, whether they turned their arms to the aid of Thurii or of Tarentum, all represent the vain attempt to prevent the rapid disintegration of the Italiot civilization, which, owing to geographical conditions and

to the frequent Sabine invasions, was not destined to last beyond the fourth century. At the end of the fifth century or the beginning of the fourth, Campania was removed from the influence of Greek civilization, and there grew up instead that of the Oscans, of which too few fragments have come down to us. On the other hand, the power of Rome was being strengthened, both by the arresting of the barbarian invasions from the north, and by the able way in which the Latins took advantage of the culture of the south.

Greek historians who were contemporaries of Alexander of Epirus and the conquest of Naples, had already mentioned Rome among the cities of Greek character, and at the same time the victory of L. Camillus over the Gauls who had invaded Latium and pushed as far as Apulia, commenced to check the series of invasions from the north which were successively restrained at Sentinum, the Lacus Vadimonis, and Casteggio, and later by the natural frontier of the Alps.

The defeat of the heroic Molossian prince had no lasting results either for the conquerors or for the conquered. The Greek cities remained for only a short time subject to the Brettians and the Lucanians. The wiles and money of the Tarentines retarded for only half a century the recognition of the supremacy of the indigenous peoples of the central portion of the peninsula. Through the irony of fate, Attic Thurii, which from the time of Pericles had struggled to rival Spartan Tarentum and to keep in check the Lucanians of the neighboring city, at about the same time lost her own independence, and had to proclaim herself freed from the Lucanians on the day when she recognized forever the supremacy of Rome. Just as the hope of forming a republic in Sicily perished with Timoleon, so with the death of Alexander came to an end the plan of forming a Greek empire in Italy. Rome allied herself with, and practically ruled over, Campania the year in which Timoleon died. In the same way she seized Naples the year in which Alexander met his fate by the Acheron.[1] And, finally, the ever-increasing vigor of the Latin races was destined to frustrate the later attempts of Agathocles and Pyrrhus.

[1] See my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, p. 488.

IX

ERYX = VERRUCA?

The belief is almost unanimously held by critics that the Elymians were not indigenous to Sicily,[1] and some, such as Holm, recognize in them traces of Semitic blood.[2] In opposition to these theories I have elsewhere attempted to show that, in spite of the Asiatic appearance of their name, there is no reason for thinking that the Elymians were of different race from the Sicani. The statements of both ancient and modern writers to the contrary notwithstanding, in the last analysis the Sicani were of the same stock as the Siculi.[3]

I have also sought to show[4] that the ancient Ligurians (who without reason have been judged non-Aryan and different from the other Italic peoples) not only extended to the Apennines by Arezzo and to Latium, but occupied nearly all the shore regions of

[1] E. g., Freeman, *Hist. Sic.*, I, p. 198.

[2] Cf. Holm, *Gesch. Sic.* (Leipzig, 1870), I, p. 86.

[3] Cf. my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, pp. 123 ff. My opinion is not accurately quoted by Lupus in his translation of Freeman (p. 509). That the name of the Elymians is the same as that of the Solymians seems probable from the presence of the forms "Helymus" and "Solymus" corresponding to Ἔλυμος, just as "Egesta" corresponds to "Segesta." This is rendered still more probable by the no small number of exact parallels between Elymian, Carian, and Libyan geographical names (cf. *Storia*, etc., pp. 132 ff.). From this I did not conclude that the Elymians were of the same stock as the Solymians, and that these latter came to Sicily. I explained this identity of name by the colonies planted in both countries by the Dorian Rhodians, to whom also is due the statement that the founders of Phaselis below Mount Solymus, and of Siceliot Gela, were brothers. The correspondence between the names of the river Telmessus, near Elymian Segesta, and that of the Carian city Telmessus is also confirmed by the myths, since the legend of the river-god Crimisus, who, in the guise of a dog, had a child by the Trojan Segesta (see Serv. ad *Aen.* i. 550; cf. the coins of Segesta), is the same as that of Telmessus, the eponymous hero of the Asiatic city, who, in the form of a dog, had relations with one of the daughters of Antenor (see Dionys. Chal., fr. 4; Müller, *F. H. G.*, IV, p. 394).

[4] See my *Storia*, etc., I, pp. 56, 492 ff. For the Ligurians in Aquitania cf. Sieglin apud Hirschfeld in the *Sitzungsberichte d. Berlin Akad.*, 1896, p. 446, n. 3.

the peninsula, of Gallia Narbonensis, and of the larger islands of the Mediterranean.

It seems to me that the soundness of my theory regarding the Elymians is incontrovertibly shown by the presence among them of the same names as appear on the coast between Genoa and Luna; i. e., Segesta, Entella, and Eryx. I noted that the fifth-century coins of the Elymian Segesta lead one to suspect that the goddess Segesta there represented is the same as Segetia, the goddess of the *segetes*, honored by the Romans. Moreover, the name of the Elymian Eryx is not Semitic nor oriental, but, just as that of the like-named Ligurian city (the Lerici of today), finds its explanation in the Italic dialects.

It is my opinion that Ἔρυξ should be brought into relation with Ἐρύκη, an ancient city of the Ausonian Siculi, and also with the Volscian Verrugo. This last named town is several times mentioned by the annalists[1] in connection with fifth-century events. Diodorus in one passage literally transcribes from a Latin annalist, and writes Ἔρρουκαν πόλιν Οὐόλσκων.[2] In another place[3] he gives the hellenized form Οὐερρηγῖνος πόλεως, which, however, may be derived from one of the early Latin annalists who wrote in Greek.[4] Verrugo therefore bears the same relation to Erruca as Vitellia to Ἰταλία, and Volsci to Ὄλσοι. Ἔρυξ and Ἐρύκη are evidently different forms of the same name.

These theories become even more probable by a consideration of the sites of the different cities, and of the meaning of the corre-

[1] Liv. iv. 1. 55. 58; v. 28; Val. Max. ii. 2. 8; vi. 5. 2.

[2] Diod. xiv. 11. 6.

[3] *Ibid.*, 98. 5.

[4] Both Van der Meij (*Specimen litterarium exhibens Diordori Siculi frag. ant. hist. Rom. spectantia* [Daventriae, 1864], p. 39) and Bader (*De Diodori rerum Romanorum auctoribus* [Leipzig, 1890], p. 9) have gone astray in this matter. They give the preference to the second of the passages mentioned from Diodorus and substitute its reading Οὐερρουγῖνα for the Ἔρρουκα of the other (xiv. 11. 6). I do not agree with Meyer (*Rhein. Mus.*, XXXVII [1882], p. 611) that the double forms of the ethnic names in Diodorus (cf. Τοῦσκοι in xiv. 117, in place of the customary Τυρρηνοί; and αὐτοκράτορα, xii. 64; δικτάτωρα, xii. 80) are caused by the haste of a careless translator. They are due rather to the contemporary use of both Latin and Greek sources, as I have elsewhere shown.

PLATE II

Eryx

sponding Latin form *verruca*.[1] The Elymian Eryx was situated on the summit of a lofty height of difficult access, which is today termed Monte S. Giuliano. An analogous position was doubtless occupied by the Siculian Eryce, which was expressly termed an ἐχυρὸς τόπος.[2] From the passages in Livy quoted above, all of the commentators rightly conclude that the Volscian Verrugo was in a similar situation; and the same may be said of the Ligurian Eryx, which was in the region where the mountainous Lerici is situated today. From Gellius[3] we learn that in Cato *verruca* meant a *locum editum asperumque*. The use of this phrase to indicate the rocky summit of a height lasted through late Latin to mediaeval times, and even down to the present day.[4] A few miles from Pisa, on the extreme southern slope of the mountain-chain termed Monti Pisani from Pisa itself, is a height practically isolated on three sides, and crowned with an ancient fortress, which from its position, if instead of the plain it had had below it the sea, would have recalled the Elymian Eryx. Until mediaeval times it was termed *la Verruca*, and even today in the Pistoiese and Lunigiana regions, and especially in that of Garfagnana, which ethnographically are all strictly Ligurian, one frequently comes across similar localities termed *Verruche* or *Verrucole*.[5]

It may be well to return to ancient examples, and to note that, while according to the common tradition the mother of Servius Tullius was the wife of the ruler of Corniculum, and was called Ocresia[6] or "the mountaineer,"[7] according to a different version

[1] Cf. the relation of *vesperum* in Ennius to *hesperon* in Vergil (Cens. *De d. nat.* 24. 4).

[2] Callias apud Macrob. v. 19. 25; see below, chap. xiv.

[3] Gell. iii. 7. 6.

[4] Cf. Quint. viii. 3. 48; 6. 14; who, however, decided that the expression was not elegant.

[5] In the region of Garfagna I have often noted that many of the topographical names have a clearly Ligurian character.

[6] Dionys. iv. 1; Ovid *Fast.* vi. 627 ff.; Plut. *De fort. Rom.* 10; cf. Liv. i. 39. 5.

[7] Ocrisia or Ocresia comes from the Latin *ocrem=monte* (see Fest. s. v., p. 181 M.); cf. *Interocrea* (today Antrodoco), *Subocrini* (Plin. *N. H.* iii. 133); cf. the Umbrian *ocar, ukararx* (Bucheler, *Umbrica*, p. 81), and the Latin *Ocriculum*.

of Servius[1] the one who gave birth to Tullius was an obscure maiden who had been taken prisoner when Tarquinius captured the *civitas Vericulana.* Vericula, instead of being a diminutive of Verruca, seems to bear the same relation to it as Procas to Proculas, Romus or Remus to Romulus, Volscus to Volsculus, Turdulus to Turditanus, and Hispalus to Hispanus; and to have survived in the modern *le Verrucole.* The deeds attributed to the kings were often anticipations of events which occurred during the early Republic. On this account it would not be strange if the *civitas Vericulana* of Servius were identical with the Verrugo of Livy.

Granted that the Ἔρρουκα of Diodorus and the Verrugo of Livy correspond to the Latin *verruca*, we obtain not only an additional argument in favor of the theory that the Elymians were of Italic stock, but also a reason for holding to be without foundation the assertion that the Ligurians, among whom we find the forms Eryx and Segesta, were a non-Aryan race, and therefore different from the other peoples of the peninsula. It seems strange that a people which termed its principal city "Genua"—an Italic name derived from its position—could have been held to be non-Aryan. "Genua" was not a name given by a foreign people, and from the beginning the city presented itself as indigenous and as an ally of Rome.[2] In regard to Siculian names of Italic origin, in addition to Ducetius, Casmene, and Galaria, mentioned in my *Storia della Sicilia* (I, p. 112), we may perhaps add the Sican Κράστος, the πόλις τῶν Σικανῶν, said to be the home of Epicharmus,[3] and in which appears the equivalent of the Roman *castrum;* and also Κρίμισος, the Elymian river, which reappears both in the name of cape Κρίμισα, between Thurii and Croton, and in the Cremera, the well-known river near Veii, and not far from Rome.

The relation which we have endeavored to show as existing between the Volscian Verrugo and the Sicilian Eryce and Eryx does

[1] Serv. ad *Aen.* ii. 683.

[2] See the material collected by Mommsen, *CIL*, V, p. 885. I agree with Pedroli (*Roma e la Gallia Cisalpina*, pp. 112 ff.) concerning the condition of the allied cities.

[3] Steph. Byz., s. v. Ἐπίχαρμος.

not constitute an isolated example, since the Sicilian Echetla and Vessa have parallels in the Volscian names of Ecetra and the Sinus Vescinus.[1] Even if we accept the opinions of Keil,[2] as opposed to those of Kinch and Meister, and interpret the coin legends ϹΕΓΕϹΤΑΙΙΒ and ΕΡΥΚΑ | ΙΙΒ, not as Σεγεσταζίη and Ἐρυκαζίη, but as Σεγεσταζιβ and Ἐρυκαζιβ, this offers no serious obstacle to the theory concerning the Italic origin of the Elymians. At the worst, and granting that these coins suggest a non-Aryan element in the Elymian population, it should not be forgotten that, according to Thucydides,[3] the Elymians were a mixture of Sicani and Trojans, to whom a few Greeks had united themselves.

Leaving to one side the Trojans here localized by the Greek myth,[4] we may well admit that there were Phoenician and Libyan elements in the population of Eryx and Segesta—cities which first were allies of Carthage, and then became her subjects. It is strange that in treating of this question one should take as a basis for argument merely the coins, which belong to an age when the political and commercial influence of Carthage had become important, and should neglect the other evidence, in which any critic who frees himself from all preconceived ethnographic and linguistic ideas must find proof that the Elymian population took its origin from the other Aryan peoples of the peninsula and the island.

[1] Steph. Byz., s. v., in addition to the Sicilian Ἔχετλα, notes an Ἐχετία πόλις Ἰταλίας, and an Ἐχέτρα πόλις Ἰταλίας which is the well-known Volscian city. Possibly Ἐχετία is a second form for the name of the same city.

[2] Keil, *Ath. Mitth.*, 1895, p. 406, n. 1.

[3] Thuc. vi. 2. 3.

[4] Cf. my *Storia della Sic., etc.*, I, pp. 139 ff.

Fig. 6.—Coin of Ergetium.

Fig. 7.—Coin of Ergetium.

Fig. 8.—Coin of Naxos.

X

ERGETIUM AND NAXOS

The best-known numismatists are generally inclined to consider the following silver stater, of the normal weight of 7.90 grams, as an Italiot coin:

MEP: Bearded Dionysus, naked, standing, holding a cantharus in the right hand and a vine branch in the left.

℞: Vine branch with grapes;

and its twelfth:

MEP: Head of bearded Dionysus.

℞: Bunch of grapes.

Although Garrucci publishes this coin among those of Italy, he is undecided as to the city to which it should be assigned. Poole, following Sambon, thinks it a stater, and attributes it to one of the uncertain cities of Lucania or Bruttium; and even Head thinks it may with probability be assigned to this latter region.[1] The reasons which led the English numismatists to attribute this coin to Bruttium in Magna Graecia are, if I am not mistaken, identical with those which caused Sambon to put forth the same hypothesis. Sambon observed that one of the rarest specimens of the coins of Ergetium (by him doubtfully attributed to Merusium), weighing 7.90 g., was discovered in a Calabrian find of 1863, together with incuse coins of Achaean Caulonia, Laos, Metapontum, and Sybaris, and with archaic coins of Posidona, Tarentum, and even Caulonia. Forty of these staters weighed 7.90 g. each.[2] In addition, the style of the coin of Ergetium confirmed him in his conviction that it was of Italiot, not of Siceliot, origin.

[1] Garrucci, *op. cit.*, II, p. 154, Plate III, Figs. 9, 10; Sambon, *Recherches sur les monnaies de la presqu'île italique* (Naples, 1870), p. 239, Plate 22, Figs. 7, 8. Sambon, following Sestini, from the erroneous reading *Mer* is inclined to attribute the stater to the Sicilian Merusium mentioned by Theopompus apud Steph. Byz., s. v.; cf. also Poole, *Cat. of the Greek Coins*, "Italy," p. 395, no. 1; and Head, *op. cit.*, p. 98. The two examples of staters published by Sambon weigh 8 and 7.90 grams respectively. Poole and Head give the normal weight of 7.90 grams=122 grains.

[2] Sambon, *op. cit.*, p. 34.

Nevertheless, Sestini (*apud* Sambon) had already seen that we here had to deal with a Sicilian product, and de Luynes[1] recognized that the coins came from the Sicilian Sergentium. It could not, indeed, be otherwise. A glance at the archaic coinage of Naxos from the end of the sixth century will convince anyone of the truth of this assertion. The following is one of the earliest drachms of Naxos of the normal weight of about 5.90 g.:[2]

Head of bearded Dionysus.

℞: Grapevine with grapes: NAXION.

The points of resemblance both in the types and in the execution are very striking. The head of Dionysus on the fraction of the coin from Ergetium is similar to that on the Naxian drachm, while the reverse of the latter seems cut by the same artist who produced the stater of Ergetium. Also the forms of the letters on the coin from Ergetium take us back to the end of the sixth century, or at least to the beginning of the fifth, which is the time when the Naxian coins just discussed were struck. Thus we see that without doubt this Sergetium is not the Ergetium near Arpi in Apulia, as one might suppose, but the well-known Sergetium or Ergetium of the Siculi.[3]

We shall shortly discuss the reasons why the coins of the two cities apparently do not correspond exactly in weight, but first let us examine more closely the coins themselves, for the purpose, if not of definitely solving, at least of better determining, the problem of the location of this Siculian city.

Where Ergetium was situated is not known. From a passage in Polyaenus[4] describing the stratagem employed by Hippocrates of Gela (about 494 B. C.) in effecting its capture, we learn that it was

[1] De Luynes, *La monnaie de Servius Tullius*, p. 29, Plate 4; quoted by Garrucci, *loc. cit.*

[2] Concerning the weight of the archaic coins of Naxos, see Imhoof-Blumer, "Le système monétaire euboique," *Annuaire d. l. Soc. num.* (Paris, 1882), p. 13; cf. Head, *op. cit.*, 139; and Poole, *Cat. of the Greek Coins*, "Sicily," p. 118.

[3] The form Σερ (γερίνων) of the coin stands in the same relation to the literary form Ἐργέτιον in which the ΣΕΓΕΣΤΑΙΙΒΕΜΙ of the archaic coins of Segesta stands to the Greek form Ἔγεστα.

[4] Polyaen. v. 6.

a stronghold situated not far from the Laestrygonii Campi and Leontini. From the words of Stephen of Byzantium *ad v.* *τὸ ἐθνικὸν* Ἐργετῖνος *καὶ* Αἴτνη Ἐργετίνη, we are all the more confirmed in our conviction that it was not far from the plain where Hippocrates caused the citizens of Ergetium, who had joined him as mercenaries, to perish, and which is located at the foot of Aetna. The coins which we have just now attributed to Ergetium, and which are either but a few decades earlier than, or contemporary with, Hippocrates, make it all the more certain that it was not far from Chalcidian Naxos, a city which also fell a prey to the tyrant of Gela, just as did Ergetium, Naxian Callipolis, Chalcidian Leontini, and Zancle.[1] If any remains of Ergetium still exist, they must be searched for on some slight eminence on the eastern slopes of Aetna, where the warm sun and rich volcanic soil produced the vines which rendered prosperous both Ergetium and Naxos, and where the luxuriant and productive vineyards still arouse the admiration of the visitors to this most beautiful among the beautiful shores of Italy.

The exact site of Ergetium is a problem for local scholars to solve. Let us rather note that the perfect resemblance between the coins of the Siceliot and of the Siculian city shows that commercial relations existed between the two places and the two peoples. Thucydides, in his discussion of the first expedition sent by the Athenians to Sicily and of the siege of Naxos by the Massanian allies of Syracuse, says that *οἱ Σικελοὶ ὑπὲρ τῶν ἄκρων πολλοὶ κατέβαινον βοηθοῦντες ἐπὶ τοὺς Μεσσηνίους.*[2] This gave courage to the Naxians, who, seeing that the Leontini and the other Greek allies were arriving, made a sortie in which they put to death a thousand Messanians. The rest of the latter were put to flight, and in the retreat were killed by the *βάρβαροι* or Siculi (summer of 425 B. C.). That allies from Ergetium also were among the defenders of the city seems probable now that the coins have shown the good relations which existed between the two cities. We have every reason to believe that Ergetium was in existence at that time. It is true that it had been seized by Hippocrates, but it is not stated

[1] Herodot. vii. 154.

[2] Thuc. iv. 25. 9.

that he either destroyed it or made it suffer any harder lot than he did Naxos, which he also besieged.[1] Moreover, Ergetium is mentioned by both Pliny and Ptolemy.[2] As additional proof that such assistance was rendered may be mentioned the fact that the Naxians were also aided by Leontini, a city which lay to the south, in which direction Ergetium must of necessity have been situated.

It is interesting to notice how both the passage in Thucydides, and the identity in type and workmanship of the coins from Ergetium and Naxos, tend to show the good relations existing between the Siculi and the Chalcidio-Ionian cities. To judge by the coins, the inhabitants of Ergetium became no less hellenized in this regard than did the Elymians of Segesta. The relations between the Siculi and Syracuse, on the other hand, were far different. The authors depict the Siculi as always disposed to rebel against the powerful Doric city, and we see them continually striving to throw off her yoke. In their relations with the Ionian cities, on the contrary, they showed themselves sincere and affectionate friends. Do we not have in this an indication of the difference in character between the two races, and of the diverse, or even opposite, systems which they followed in their work of conquest? Certainly the friendship between Naxos and Ergetium recalls the policy of the Achaeans in Italy. Sybaris and Croton were friendly with the peoples in the interior, and we have possibly a case analogous to the one here under discussion in that of Pandosia, the capital of the Oenotrians,[3] whose coins from the middle of the fifth century show a familiarity with Greek language and customs, and also an alliance with Croton.[4]

In regard to the metrological problem, I formerly attempted to explain why the staters of Ergetium were similar to those of the Achaean cities of Italy. My observations in this connection—which I shall not here recapitulate—are shown to be erroneous by a communication which Imhoof-Blumer was kind enough to send me after their publication. He informs me that neither of the two

[1] Herodot. vii. 154.

[2] Plin. *N. H.* iii. 8. 91; Ptol. iii. 4. 7.

[3] Strab. vi, p. 256 C.

[4] Head, *op. cit.*, p. 90; cf. Garrucci, *op. cit.*, II, p. 147.

specimens of the coins of Sergetium, one of which is in the British Museum and the other in Paris, is well preserved, and that their normal weight, instead of 7.90 g., may originally have reached 8.40 g. or even 8.60 g. He also calls attention to the variation in the weight of the Siceliot coins, and states that didrachms of the same die vary between 9 g. and 7.90 g. He concludes as follows: "For Sergentium therefore, as everywhere in Sicily, we may assume the Euboean rather than the Italiot standard." With these views of the famous numismatist coincides the fact, which I have elsewhere noted, that fractions of the coins of Ergetium have the same weight as the obols of Naxos of the same period, and are of the same form and type as their respective drachms.[1]

[1] See Poole, *Cat.*, etc., "Sicily," p. 118, nos. 4, 5.

XI

PIACUS

Diodorus[1] relates that after the death of Ducetius, who six years before had founded Calacte, the Syracusans, having subdued all of the Siculian towns except Trinacia, decided to capture this also. Trinacia, he adds, was then the greatest of these towns, and abounded in valiant men. The Syracusans moved against it, after having assembled all of their own and the allied forces. The Trinacians had no allies, since these had all become subject to Syracuse, but they defended themselves bravely. The youths all perished in the combat, and the old men preferred voluntary death to the ignominy of servitude. The Syracusans reduced the rest of the population to slavery, and sent rich gifts to Delphi from the spoils.

From the words of Diodorus, this Τρινακίη was evidently an important city, but as yet no one has been able to determine its location. It is generally connected with the Tyracinenses or Triracinenses among the Sicilian stipendiaries mentioned by Pliny,[2] and with Τυρακῖναι, of which Stephen of Byzantium says (*s. v.*): πόλις Σικελίας μικρὰ μέν, εὐδαίμων δ' ὅμως . . . . Τυρακὴν δὲ αὐτὴν Ἀλέξανδρος ἐν Εὐρώπῃ καλεῖ. Others have suspected that in Τρινακίη we should recognize the very name of Trinacria or Sicily.[3]

Neither of these hypotheses, however, is correct. Tyracinae and the Tyracinenses were probably situated south of Syracuse and not far from that city.[4] This being the case, the arms of the Syra-

[1] Diod. xii. 29; 440 B. C.

[2] Plin. *N. H.* iii. 91.

[3] See Schubring in *Rhein. Mus.*, XXVIII (1873), p. 116; Holm, *Gesch. Sic.*, I, p. 73; Freeman, *History of Sicily*, I, pp. 158, 511 ff.

[4] For the position of Tyracinae see my *Alcune osserv. sulla storia e sulla geog. d. Sicilia durante il dominio romano* (Palermo, 1888), pp. 54, 140. To the passage there quoted from Cicero (*Verr.* II. iii. 129) may perhaps be added that of Vibius Sequester, who among the swamps records "Tyraco Syracusis," alluding possibly

cusans, who were then masters of nearly all the Siculian towns, would not have been turned against a neighboring city, but against one located at a greater distance, and, as we shall see, toward the north. In regard to this hypothesis, and also to the second one (that Trinacia was the poetic name for Sicily itself),[1] it should be observed that in the summary of the twelfth book of Diodorus, where we should expect mention of the expedition of the Syracusans against the Trinacians, we read instead: *Ὡς Συρακόσιοι στρατεύσαντες ἐπὶ Πικηνοὺς τὴν πόλιν κατέσκαψαν.*

It must be admitted that in one place or the other the text is corrupt. In view of the fact that *Τρινακίη* is totally unknown, which is very strange considering that it is represented as an important city, the preference should be given to the passage mentioning the *Πικηνοί*, whose exact name is given by Stephen of Byzantium, *s. v. Πίακος, πόλις Σικελίας, οἱ πολῖται Πιακηνοί.*

Instead of *Πιακηνοί* we should expect the form *Πιακῖνοι*, with the suffix *-ῖνος* proper to Siceliot and Siculian names;[2] and possibly this form explains better, from a paleographical standpoint, the change from *Τρινάκιοι* to *Πιακῖνοι.* At any rate, the form *Πιακῖνοι* is attested by a rare coin first correctly published by Imhoof-Blumer.[3] This coin is a bronze half-obol on which we read the letters Γ·Ι·Α·Κ·Ι·Ν· (*ων*), separated by six dots to indicate the monetary value. On the face is the head of a horned river-god; on the reverse, a dog seizing a fawn by the throat. Imhoof-Blumer rightly rejects the hypothesis of Parthey and Schubring who identify Piacus with the recent name of Piazza Armerina, near Aidone.[4] He is disposed to accept the opinion of Corcia,

to the harbor of Syracuse and to the near-by marsh of Vindicari, where I locate Tyracinae.

[1] Freeman, too, quotes this hypothesis, and accepts too readily the opinion of Dorville and Schubring, who place Trinacia at Aidone in the center of the island. There is no more reason for placing Trinacia at Cittadella di Aidone, where many ancient remains exist, than for placing there any other Siculian city the location of which is unknown.

[2] See Steph. Byz., s. v. *Ἀβακαῖνον.*

[3] Imhoof-Blumer, *Mon. grecques* (Amsterdam, 1882), p. 26, Plate B, no. 11.

[4] Head, *Hist. num.*, pp. 144, 115, fig. 73; cf. Poole, *Cat. Gr. Coins*, "Sicily," p. 45, no. 25.

who finds traces of the name of Piacus in that of Placa-Baiana, near Bronte. The river in this case would be the Symaethus. The style of the coin, and especially the head of the river-god, recall, as Head has observed, the head on a tetradrachm from Catana.[1] The river symbolized by the dog seizing a fawn, he thinks, may be one of the torrents which at times descend from Aetna, perhaps the Acis or the Amenanus. It would seem, however, that the fact that the river is already typified on the face of the coin would lead one to seek some other explanation, and I prefer to see on the reverse a simple hunting-scene. The type of the dog tearing a hare or deer is seen on coins from Agyrium.[2] The fawn seized by the dog recalls the fact that the mountains about Aetna, among which Agyrium was situated, on account of the numerous deer there

[1] Schubring (in *Rhein. Mus.*, XXVIII [1873], pp. 116 ff.) gives no reason for identifying Piazza with Piacus. As Holm suggests (in Imhoof-Blumer, *loc. cit.*), the name of "Piazza" (from Platea ?) may well be of recent origin. The name "Placa" also does not seem to me ancient. In addition to the Placa-Baiana in question, there exist in Sicily a Placa S. Salvatore near Francavilla, and a Plache near Aetna. Placa, according to d'Amico (*Dizion. topogr. di Sicilia*, ed. Di Marzo [Palerno, 1856], III, p. 448, col. 2), signifies something flat, and is the Sicilian form corresponding to the Latin *plaga*.

[2] Poole (*op. cit.*, p. 25, no. 6) and Head (*op. cit.*, p. 109) wrongly see on a coin of Agyrium a leopard devouring a hare. Salinas (*Le monete d. ant. città di Sic.*, p. 39, Plate XV, Fig 8) is likewise in error in describing it as a leopard devouring the head of a deer. The supposed leopard seems to me to be a dog, just as the animal which figures on coins from the neighboring Centuripa is a dog, and not a leopard as these authorities suppose (Poole, *op. cit.*, p. 55; Head, *op. cit.*, p. 118). I also think that these dogs on the coins of Centuripa and Agyrium are of the same kind as the thousand *κύνες . . . . ἱεροὶ ὑπεραίροντες τὸ κάλλος τοὺς Μολοττοὺς κύνας* from the neighboring Adranus (see Ael. *N. A.* xi. 20). It is precisely on account of their size that these animals have been thought to be leopards—animals which never existed in Sicily, and which could not be represented as seizing hares. The physician Scribonius Largus narrates (*Composit. Med.* 171) that his teacher, Appuleius Celsus of Centuripa, was in the habit every year of sending to that city a remedy of his which was of aid in cases of hydrophobia. It is perhaps worthy of note that even today the peasants from the most remote portions of Sicily, who have been bitten by mad dogs, visit the miracle-working spring of S. Vito at Regalbuto, situated between Agyrium and Centuripa. Possibly in these two cities, as in the neighboring Adranus, were also *ἱεροὶ κύνες*. Moreover, it is admitted by these numismatists that a dog is represented on another coin from Agyrium (see Salinas, p. 29, Plate XV, no. 15; Poole, p. 26, no. 8; Head, p. 109), although a close examination will show that it does not differ from the so-called leopard.

found were called Nebrodes.[1] The scene on the reverse of the coin has probably some symbolic meaning, and might refer either to a townsman of Piacus overtaking a fleeing enemy,[2] or to the numerous sacred dogs in the region about Adranus. At any rate, the few indications furnished by this coin lead us to place Piacus in a region to the north or northwest of Catana.

This supposition is further supported by an examination of the political value of the accounts of Diodorus. Although the information which he gives us concerning the history of Sicily for the period between the driving-out of the Deinomenids and the second Athenian expedition is not abundant, and is at times very fragmentary, it is in the present instance sufficient to enable us to determine the location of the pretended Τρινακίη, or rather of Πίακος.

About 451 B. C. the Syracusans succeeded in overthrowing the confederation of the Siculi led by Ducetius. After the defeat at Nomae, Ducetius was obliged to flee to Syracuse, to which he intrusted both himself and the entire region which had been under his control.[3] The region which thus came into the power of Syracuse was situated between the territory of Agrigentum and that of Leontini, and embraced both Menae, the home of Ducetius, and Palice, which he had made the seat of the Siculian confederation.[4] About 446 B. C., shortly before the time when the Syracusans defeated the proud Agrigentines at the Himera,[5] Ducetius fled from Corinth, whither he had been relegated by Syracuse, and, returning to Sicily, landed at Calacte, where he founded a colony and associated with himself Archonides, the despot of Herbita, with the intention of creating another Siculian confederation.[6]

[1] Solin. 5. 12. Mommsen: "Nebroden damnae et hinnulei gregatim pervagantur: inde Nebrodes." This derivation seems to me better than that of Holm (*Gesch. Sic.*, I, p. 95), who thinks they were thus named from Nebrod or Nimrod.

[2] One is reminded of the coin of Regium with the figure of a hare, which possibly gave rise to the ancient expression, Ῥηγίνου δειλότερος; see I. F. Ebert, *Disser. Siculae,* I (Regimonti, 1825), pp. 187 ff.

[3] Diod. xi. 92. 1: ἑαυτόν [i. e., Δουκέτιον] τε καὶ τὴν χώραν ἧς ἦν κύριος παρέδωκε τοῖς Συρακοσίοις.

[4] *Ibid.* xi. 78. 5; 88. 6.

[5] *Ibid.* xii. 6.

[6] *Ibid.* xii. 8. (cf. 29): ἀντεποιήσατο μὲν [i. e., Δουκέτιος] τῆς τῶν Σικελῶν ἡγεμονίας.

Thus, instead of approaching the shores which were under the dominion or hegemony of Syracuse, he landed at a place inhabited by people who did not recognize the supremacy of the powerful Doric city, and where, among the Nebrodes mountains, various indigenous tribes still preserved their independence. The political plan of Ducetius was well conceived. Diodorus, in speaking of the events of the year 442 B. C., which was about two years before the death of Ducetius and the taking of Piacus, observes that Sicily was then quiet, and that the treaties of alliance which had been concluded between Gelo and the Carthaginians after the victory at the Himera (480 B. C.) were still in force. He adds that the other Siceliot cities, including even Agrigentum subsequent to the battle of the Himera,[1] recognized the hegemony of Syracuse. Ducetius, however, although he had come to a place to which the dominion of Syracuse had not as yet extended, did not remain idle, and was proposing to found a new Siculian confederation, when death overtook him in the midst of his plans.[2] Since Diodorus tells of the expedition of the Syracusans and their allies against Piacus, immediately after mentioning the death of Ducetius, it is clear that the two facts are in some manner connected. Between 446 and about 440, while Ducetius had been planning to construct a Siculian empire as a rival to that of Syracuse, the Syracusans themselves had not been idle, and hardly was Ducetius out of the way before they seized upon his death as an occasion for conquering the last refuge of the Siculi. When Piacus was attacked, all of the neighboring cities had already been captured. Since, therefore, Ducetius had founded a new colony at Calacte, and had allied himself with the despot of Herbita, which was situated not far from Nicosia and the *Monti Nebrodi*, the Siculian city of Piacus was probably not far from these mountains, on the road leading from Catana to Calacte. The very account of the defense of the city and of the brave death of the Piacines is better suited to a band of independent and fierce mountaineers than to the inhabitants of a more civilized city on the plains.

According to the authoritative judgment of Head and Poole,

[1] 446 B. C.; Diod. xii. 26. 3.

[2] Diod. xii. 29. 1.

the above-mentioned coins of Piacus date from the final years of the fifth century; and Imhoof-Blumer also attributes them to this period. If this opinion is correct (as it seems to me to be), we must admit that after its destruction the city of Piacus was rebuilt upon its old site. This fact need cause no surprise. With brief intervals many of the Siculian and Siceliot cities were several times destroyed and rebuilt. On the other hand, the existence of Piacus between 415 and 400 B. C., as Head would conclude from the coins in question, corresponds well with the political conditions of that time.

When, after 427, the Athenians came to Sicily, they found that Inessa, which was situated at the foot of Aetna and on the road leading to the Nebrodes and Calacte, was in the hands of the Syracusans. Out of hatred toward the Syracusans, by whom they were harshly governed, during the ensuing campaign the Siculi of that region favored the Athenians.[1] When in 415 the Athenians undertook their second and greater expedition, they found that Hybla, Gereatis, Inessa, and Centuripa were hostile.[2] Evidently these places were at that time well disposed toward Syracuse, which had extended anew in that region her hegemony or domination, as the case might be, to the detriment of the Chalcidian cities of Catana and Naxos, and of the Siculi. That Gylippus found Siculi who were friendly to Syracuse in the region in question between the Himera and the Leontine territory was due to the fact, as shown by Thucydides, that Archonides, the friend of the Athenians, was dead.[3] In this individual we should probably recognize either the very Archonides of Herbita who was a friend of Ducetius, or else one of his descendants.

At the time of the second Athenian expedition, therefore, it was possible for Piacus to have recovered to some extent from her crushing defeat, but the fact that she is never mentioned after 440 shows that her new lease on life was but of brief duration, and that

[1] Thuc. iii. 103.

[2] Thuc. vi. 62. 5, 94.

[3] Thuc. vii. 1. 4: *τῶν Σικελῶν τινες οἳ πολὺ προθυμότερον προσχωρεῖν ἑτοῖμοι ἦσαν τοῦ τε Ἀρχωνίδου νεωστὶ τεθνηκότος, ὃς τῶν ταύτῃ Σικελῶν βασιλεύων τινῶν καὶ ὢν οὐκ ἀδύνατος τοῖς Ἀθηναίοις φίλος ἦν.* Both Holm (II, p. 39) and Freeman (III, pp. 158, 236) agree that one has to deal with the same Archonides.

she soon again provoked the wrath of powerful Syracuse. To judge from the words of Diodorus, Piacus was an important city of the Siculi, ranking with Hybla and Ergetium; and like these places, as shown by the above-mentioned coins, she received the germs of civilization from the Ionic Chalcidian cities.[1] And since, for the period anterior to that of the Deinomenids, the history of even such important towns as Naxos and Catana is nearly all lost, it is not strange that we know nothing of Piacus save for the tale concerning the heroic end of her citizens.

[1] For Ergetium, see above, chap x

XII

THE ARCHAIC GREEK RELIEF OF S. MAURO AND THE ANCIENT CITIES OF THE HERAEAN PLATEAU

The beautiful archaic Greek relief which is here[1] for the first time depicted was discovered in November, 1837, by a peasant who was plowing in the region of S. Mauro, nearly five miles distant from Caltagirone. Its discovery came to the notice of Baron Filippo Perticone, who at that time was devoting himself to the study of the antiquities of Caltagirone. He hastened to carry the precious monument to a place of safety, and four years later published it in a pamphlet, in which he also promised a reproduction of the relief, together with many other antique objects which he had discovered.[2] Such plates, as far as I know, were never published.[3] It is this circumstance, together with certain inaccuracies in the pamphlet,[4] and the unfavorable criticism of a rather well-known Sicilian bibliographer, that has kept so precious an object from students of the early art and history of Sicily. It would still be unknown, and would have remained so for who knows how long, had I not decided to include a scientific explora-

[1] See Plate III.

[2] *Antichità della greca Gela mediterranea oggi Caltagirone, rinvenute, osservate, e discritte* da Filippo M.ª Perticone (Catania: Giontini, 1841); see pp. 18 ff. Perticone says that in that region were found "diverse objects of burnt clay, and bronze images of different kinds, among others a fine cow of Corinthian (?) metal;" and adds, that also "a quantity of coins, both Graeco-Sicilian and Roman, come daily to light." Many years later, in 1857, the author reprinted his work at Catania under the title: *Le antichità della Gela medit. oggi Caltagirone.*

[3] The plates are lacking in the copy given me by Baron Perticone himself, nor could I find them in the public library of Caltagirone, which I examined carefully.

[4] For example, an inscription which Perticone says was in the fortress of Caltagirone has been correctly identified by Mommsen as no. 1067* of Vol. X of the *CIL;* and the same lack of accuracy is seen in the case of other inscriptions in the pamphlet. But while Perticone showed himself ready to accept any and all material, I do not think he ever knowingly deceived.

tion of Caltagirone in my itinerary during a recent visit to Sicily for the purpose of collecting the necessary material for the compilation of the *Supplementa Italica* of the *CIL.*

In addition to the hope—which was to some extent realized—of finding epigraphical material, I was led to visit this city, which is for the most part neglected by travelers and archaeologists, by the desire of solving a historical problem which had long been present in my mind. It seemed very strange that in that corner of Sicily there should be such a lack of monuments of the Greek and Roman periods, although the references in ancient authors, the history of the island, and the nature of the country would lead one to expect exactly the opposite. On these Heraean mountains, justly celebrated by the ancients for their fertility and beauty,[1] and in this region which even today passes for one of the richest and most densely populated of the island, thanks to the Greek culture which from east as well as west ascended the valleys in which Gela, Camarina, Syracuse, Megara, and Leontini had been founded, there was early formed that confederation of the Siculi which for some time even tried to rival the Syracusan dominion, a few decades after it had been established by the Deinomenids. I was, moreover, persuaded that in the region about Caltagirone—a city which in modern times has been considered as the first on the Mediterranean side of Sicily—should be located some of those *oppida* of the Siculi which are alluded to more or less frequently by early writers, and which, for various reasons which we shall in part have occasion to notice, have been, and still are, attributed by modern Sicilian historians to other and distant localities.

The precious monument, the obscure and forgotten resting-place of which I had the good fortune to discover in a garret at the Lyceum of Caltagirone,[2] not only confirmed, but even surpassed

[1] Cf. the excellent and ample description of their fertility in Diod. iv. 84.

[2] I owe my knowledge of this monument to Baron Perticone himself. At the time of my visit this nearly blind octogenarian, who was just recovering from a severe illness, in response to my request for epigraphical material, came from his estate to Caltagirone to give me his only copy of his publication, and to show me the antiquities which, together with the monument in question, he had presented to the town of Caltagirone. It is hardly necessary to say how grateful I am to him

PLATE III

Archaic Relief from S. Mauro

my expectations. It is sculptured upon a slab of compact limestone 0.85 m. high, 1.62 m. broad, and 0.14 m. thick. In the upper zone are represented two groups of dancing satyrs, one to the right and the other to the left. The space between these groups is much corroded, but one can still distinguish traces of another figure which bore an oenochoe. In the lower zone are two sphinxes, back to back, and holding one paw raised. In the center, between the wings of the sphinxes, is a double palmette, the upper portion of which seemed to me to show plainly discernible traces of painting. The details are executed with exceeding fineness and delicacy of touch.

I shall not attempt to describe this monument from an archaeological standpoint. From now on it will certainly be studied by students of archaeology and art. The striking similarity between the Bacchic dance in the first zone and the dances frequently represented on archaic Greek vases will be noticed at first glance; likewise that between the type of the sphinxes and the sphinx represented on the archaic metope from Selinunte recently discovered by Salinas; between the arrangement of the hair of the sphinxes and that, for example, of the Apollo of Tenea; and between the arrangement of the figures and that of the figures on certain bronze plates from Olympia. In this manner all of the peculiarities of the relief should be noted, taking into account the form and proportion, and the distribution and importance of the subject.

I repeat that I leave to archaeologists the task of publishing this monument from the standpoint of its artistic value, and of bringing out by minute comparisons its relation to the art of the Peloponnese and of Rhodes. Certainly from now on it will find a place in all the histories of sculpture and of Greek art.[1] It will be found natural I hope, that I, who am especially a student of history, and who came across the relief while in search of epigraphical and topographical

for this. I must also express my gratitude to Dr. Salvatore Di Gregorio, professor of natural science in the Lyceum of Caltagirone, who aided me in finding and photographing the monument. The photograph itself I owe to the kindly and disinterested courtesy of Sig. Benedetto Bellia-Malfa, of Caltagirone.

[1] As a consequence of the publication in Italy of this paper, the relief is now mentioned in Perrot et Chipiez, VIII, p. 497.

data, should limit myself to bringing out its importance from a chronological and historical point of view.

As regards the dating of the monument, I think there can be no dispute among archaeologists, and it may with almost absolute certainty be placed in the first decades of the sixth century B. C. It was probably of architectural origin, and may without doubt be considered as a product of the Dorian art of Gela. Monte S. Mauro, where the relief was found, is situated about sixteen miles from Gela. It dominates two valleys—those of the Maroglio and of a minor tributary—and in a certain measure closes the valley of the Maroglio, the stream which descends from Caltagirone and empties into the sea at Terranova, the ancient Gela. On the side toward Caltagirone, which faces it but a short distance away, the hill of S. Mauro ends very precipitously; and it may be asserted with sufficient certainty, even by one only slightly versed in the study of military science, that the city there situated would have been the extreme colony and outpost of Gela in that region, by means of which she not only guarded the valley of the Maroglio, but also protected herself and her territory from the neighboring plateau, on which are now situated Caltagirone, and, farther away, Granmichele, Viccini, Buccheri, and Buscemi, and where in early times were located the Siculian populations which were soon succeeded by colonies from Leontini, Megara, and Syracuse.[1]

The chronological data furnished by Thucydides are based on an approximate calculation by generations. According to these, seventy years after its foundation (c.734 B. C.) Syracuse was able, by the foundation of Acrae, to control the entire pla-

[1] It is evident that, had they been able, the Geloans would have occupied Caltagirone instead of S. Mauro, since the former commanded the principal valley leading to the territory of Leontini. That they did not means one of two things: either the plateau now occupied by Caltagirone was in the hands of the Siculi, or else Leontini had already pressed as far as Caltagirone when the Geloans occupied S. Mauro. Leontini is said to have been founded (729 B. C) about forty years before Gela. Of these two hypotheses the former seems to me preferable. Professor Di Gregorio tells me that a paleontographical study of the grottoes near Caltagirone would yield a rich harvest. The Arab name of Caltagirone would seem to mean "city of grottoes;" see A. Cremona, *Delle origini di Caltagirone* (Palermo, 1892).

teau above her. This assured her a means of communicating with the interior, both with the Siculi and with the southern shore of the island where, forty-five years before Acrae, she had founded Camarina (c. 599 B. C.). The position of S. Mauro and its distance from Gela correspond in the main fairly well with the position and distance of Acrae in relation to Syracuse. Admitting that it had required two generations for the Geloans to get possession of the upper valley of the Maroglio, as far as the hill of S. Mauro where it ends, we may conclude that Gela, which, according to the same computation based on Thucydides, was founded forty-five years later than Syracuse (i. e., about 689 B. C.), seized that place about the end of the seventh century.[1] The date of the founding of Acrae has been taken for this comparison, not from love of conventional parallelism, but because of natural analogy. If Syracuse, whose actions on the left were limited by the neighboring Megarians, needed two generations to obtain complete control of the plateau behind her, a similar extension of power could not have been accomplished in less time by Gela, which, in addition to the conquest of the valley of the Maroglio, had of necessity to provide for the simultaneous subjection of the other valleys which run back from the Geloan plain, and which afford means of communication with the regions in which Mazzarino and Piazza Armerina[2] are situated.

The nature of the stone upon which our relief is cut shows that it could not have been carved during thefirst few years after the founding of Gela, but rather several generations later, when the Lindians, who founded the new city, had gained possession of the surrounding territory. Professor Salvatore Di Gregorio, in answer to my question, informs me that the material is commonly called *pietra di Palazzuolo* (Acrae), and that it is a more compact variety of the Syracusan limestone. He adds that even today these two

[1] Thuc. vi. 3 ff. For the character of this chronology see Busolt in *Rhein. Mus.*, XL (1885), pp. 466 ff.

[2] According to an early reference, which I think was first made use of by me (see my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, p. 235, n. 4), certain Geloan colonists are said to have perished fighting their enemies. The occupation of the territory was certainly not entirely unopposed and pacific.

materials are freely used at Caltagirone in better-class constructions.[1] Considering the distance between the height of S. Mauro and that of S. Palazzuolo-Acreide, and also the distance between S. Mauro and Gela, and further considering the fact that the relief belongs without doubt to the sixth century, it must be admitted that it confirms the approximate correctness of the chronology of Thucydides which deals with the Greek colonies of Sicily. Bearing this in mind, it is perhaps not too bold an assertion that, just as some of the archaic reliefs of Selinus are attributed to the early years when that city was founded by the Megarian Hyblaeans, so our relief may easily belong to the first few years after the time when the Geloans, having taken possession of the height of S. Mauro, founded a colony there.

Let us now consider whether a name may be given to this city of Greek foundation, and whether the city which was situated on the height of S. Mauro corresponds to any of the pre-existing cities of the Siculi which the Geloans later occupied.

The exact location of many of the Siculian cities of the interior is still unknown, and, in the present state of our knowledge, any attempt to determine it may seem premature, and possibly useless. If, however, while hopefully awaiting future excavations, I dare discuss this problem, it is because there seems to me good reason for so doing. I hope at least to outline more clearly the disputed points, and to bring out the important fact that on the summits of the Heraean Mountains we should seek several of the more famous cities of the Siculi, which have wrongly, as it seems to me, been attributed to other regions of the island.

Many names present themselves to the mind. I exclude at once Echetla, not alone because it is never mentioned for so early a period, but especially because it seems certainly to have stood at a more eastern point of the Heraean plateau, at or near Vizzini.[2]

[1] Although the case is far different, I cannot refrain from recalling that when, in the sixth century, the Geloans built their treasury at Olympia, they carried with them the necessary material; see *Ausgrabungen v. Olympia*, p. 33. Thanks to the researches of Dörpfeld, it is known that others, such as the Sicyonians, followed their example.

[2] According to Diod. xx. 32, it was evidently a fortress commanding a valley

Eryce may also be passed over, for, as Cluver has already noted, it occupied a position near the lake of the Palici. According to Callias, Eryce was ninety stades from the border of the Geloan territory, and occupied a strong position above the famous lake.[1]

between the territory of Leontini and that of Camarina. When Polybius (i. 15) says that for the period of Hiero II it was *ἐν μέσῃ κειμένην τῇ τῶν Συρακουσίων καὶ Καρχηδονίων ἐπαρχίᾳ*, this should, I think, be brought into relation with the boundaries which existed shortly after under Hiero and the Roman dominion. See Diod. xxiii. 4. 1; cf. my *Osserv. s. storia e s. ammin. d. Sicilia* (Palermo, 1888), p. 60, n. 3, where I accept the opinion of Neuling, who thinks that Echetla is also mentioned in Diod. xxiii. 5. I shall on another occasion give a complete and satisfactory explanation of the passage from Polybius. Here it would take too long, and be out of place. It may merely be noted that even in the peace between Syracuse and Carthage in 405 B. C. (cf. Diod. xiv. 114), Echetla, according to all probability, marked one of the confines of Syracuse or of Leontini.

[1] Callias apud Macrob. v. 19. 25: *ἡ δὲ Ἐρύκη τῆς μὲν Γελῴας ὅσον ἐνενήκοντα στάδια διέστηκεν.* He adds that it was an *ἐχυρὸς τόπος*, and that *ὑφ' ᾗ* were the Delli, the brothers of the Palici. I entirely agree with Michaelis (*Die Paliken* [Dresden, 1856], pp. 6 ff.) in thinking that at first the Delli and the Palici were one and the same people. At any rate, even granting that they were not identical, according to Macrobius himself, who reports it, they lived close (*nec inde longe*) together. Cluver thought of Catalfano for Eryce. Certain modern writers have wrongly placed it at Caltagirone, others at Rammacca. It seems to me that it should be located in the wedge formed between the two rivers Margherita (or Tonchio) and Fiume de Margi (Fiume di Caltagirone). It is uncertain whether the like-named river *Ἐρύκη* mentioned by Duris (apud Steph. Byz., s. v. *Ἀκράγαντες*) should be identified with the first or second of these rivers. Modern writers are inclined to place the Palice of Ducetius on the opposite height, where Palagonia is today. Moreover, from Diodorus (xi. 88. 6) it is evident that Ducetius transferred *Μινές* (thus cod. P.) or Minae, his native town, to the plain near the lake of the Palici. From a gloss of Stephen which has been overlooked (s. v. *Πελαγονία, χώρα Σικελίας*) it results that the modern name, rather than Palice, corresponds to the ancient name, and is identical with Palagonia.

Since I have touched upon this point, I may be permitted to note that the much-discussed references to Minae are merely the result of a duplication in Diodorus of one and the same statement. Diodorus says (xi. 78. 5) that Ducetius *Μέναινον* (*Μεναῖνον* cod. P.) *μὲν πόλιν ἔκτισε καὶ τὴν σύνεγγυς χώραν τοῖς κατοικισθεῖσι διεμέρισε.* In the second passage, which has already been quoted (xi. 88. 6), he affirms that *τὰς Μενέας* (*Μίνεας* cod. P.; cf. Steph. Byz., s. v. *Μεναί*) *ἥτις ἦν αὐτοῦ πατρίς, μετῴκισε εἰς τὸ πεδίον, καὶ πλησίον τοῦ τεμένους τῶν ὀνομασμένων Παλικῶν ἔκτισε πόλιν ἀξιόλογον ἣν . . . . ὀνόμαζε Παλικήν*, and adds (90. 1): *Δουκέτιος τὴν Παλικὴν κτίσας . . . . κατεκληρούχησε τὴν ὅμορον χώραν.* It is clear that *Μέναινος* and *Μεναί* are two forms of the same name, just as *Λεόντιον* and *Λεοντίνη*, and are equivalent to Minae. The difference in form, in addition to the fact that two authors were followed who referred the same events

We must, on the other hand, pause briefly to discuss Omphace, and also Mactorium, Morgantina, and Galerina. Omphace was said to be a town of the Sicani (πόλισμα Σικανῶν), and older than Gela itself. From it the Rhodian Antiohemus, the founder of Gela, is reported to have carried away a statue which, like many other works of art among the Rhodian colonists of Gela and Agrigentum, was held to be the work of Daedalus.[1] Art critics may determine whether our relief should receive a like attribution. It would seem in this case that too much weight might easily be laid upon such references. It should be taken into account that the ancients rightly distinguished between the Siculi and the Sicani. Ethnographically such a division has no justification, but from a political and geographical standpoint it is entirely borne out by what we know of the history and location of these peoples. Gela stood, so to speak, in the territory which separated one from the other, and if the statement of Pausanias is correct, we may at once exclude the supposition that Omphace could have been located at S. Mauro, which was in the direction of, or even actually within, the territory of the Siculi.[2]

As to Mactorium, this was evidently also a very ancient city, as is shown by the fact that Philistus speaks of its foundation in the first book of his history,[3] and by its mention in connection with the Geloan revolt as related by Herodotus, this revolt occurred before the fifth century at least. From Herodotus we learn that Mactorium was ὑπερ Γέλης,[4] but the events which occurred might apply to Niscemi, which is situated on a hill commanding

to different periods, it seems to me, caused Diodorus to mention twice, under different dates, the same event—i. e., the transference of Minae, the native town of Ducetius, to the plain, and the founding of Palice. Whether or not this opinion be accepted, there is nothing strange in supposing Diodorus guilty of several of these duplications, which are of such frequent occurrence in early Greek and Roman history. At the very point where he refers to the history of Sybaris (xi. 90) he gives a conspicuous example of double redaction which led to diverse narrations of the same facts (cf. xii. 10).

[1] Paus. viii. 46. 2; ix. 40. 4.

[2] For the geographical value of the designations Siculi and Sicani, see my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I pp. 94 ff.

[3] Philist. apud Steph. Byz. s. v.

[4] Herodot. vii. 153.

the road between Gela and S. Mauro, or to Mazzarino. At about the place where the last-named city is located Ptolemy[1] places a city called Μάκυρον, which is entirely unknown. This fact has several times given rise to the hypothesis that the modern Mazzarino corresponds to the form Μακτωρίνος. Naturally it would be hazardous to venture any definite opinion upon this point.

Let us pass on to Morgantina. It has been the custom to locate this on Mount Judica, which dominates the plain of Catania and stands opposite the mouth of the Simeto. This theory, however, is certainly wrong, even though it seems favored by a passage in Diodorus which states that when Magon was contending against Dionysius I, he encamped ἐν τῇ Ἀγυρυναίων χώρᾳ παρὰ τὸν Χρύσαν ποταμὸν ἐγγὺς τῆς ὁδοῦ τῆς φερούσης εἰς Μοργαντῖναν.[2] This passage, if it stood alone, might justify the placing of the city on Mount Judica, but since, as we shall see, many other passages prove that it was situated much nearer Syracuse and more to the south, we are forced to conclude either that Morgantina was the principal city of this entire inland district, and that on this account the road of which Diodorus speaks was named from it, as from an important center; or else that its territory extended so far on that side (as did later that of Caltagirone) as to reach the valley of the Chrysas or Dittaino.[3]

That Morgantina must really be sought on the summit of the Heraeans, at a point which marks the boundary between the territory of Camarina and that of Syracuse, is seen from Thucydides (iv. 65), who, in speaking of the peace of Gela, 424 B. C., concluded as a result of the exertions and exhortations of the Syracusan Hermocrates, says that there was established τοῖς δὲ Καμαριναίοις Μοργαντίνην εἶναι, ἀργύριον τακτὸν τοῖς Συρακουσίοις ἀποδοῦσιν.[4] It is easy to understand why the inhabitants of

[1] Ptol. iii. 4.7.

[2] Diod. xiv. 95. 2.

[3] That many of the Siculian cities possessed extended territories in antiquity, when the island had no more than sixty-eight communes, is natural. Just as in antiquity the Centuripini were granted a considerable part of the territory of the neighboring towns (Cic. *Ver.* II. iii, 104), so after the twelfth century Caltagirone became mistress of the lands of Fatanasino and Judica; see Amari, *Storia dei Musulmani di Sicilia*, III, p. 228.

[4] Beloch, *La populazione antica della Sicilia* (Palermo, 1889), p. 13, n. 7, is

Camarina, who were continually contending over boundaries with Syracuse,[1] and who were therefore on friendly terms with the Leontini, who were likewise enemies of Syracuse,[2] should have sought an outlet toward the plain of Leontini, and have aimed to secure a foothold among the Heraean heights which dominated such a means of communication. Moreover, that Morgantina was really situated on these heights is shown by the other references to it, from which it may be of advantage to derive a few data concerning this important Siculian city which we find mentioned in the various periods of the early history of the island.

Diodorus, in speaking of the conquests of Ducetius, immediately after stating that he founded Minae (probably Palice, see above), adds: *στρατευσάμενος δ' ἐπὶ πόλιν ἀξιόλογον Μογραντῖναν καὶ χειρωσάμενος αὐτὴν δόξαν ἀπηνέγκατο παρὰ τοῖς ὁμοέθνεσι.*[3] Discussing the wars of Dionysius I against the Siculi, he then says that he captured *Μέναινον* and Morgantina.[4] Finally the same author, in speaking of the slave war, says of Salvius Tryphon that, having besieged Morgantina, he overran the country as far as the plain of Leontini, and adds that he went to the lake of the Palici and sacrificed to these divinities.[5] Also the exile Agathocles, while leading the contingent from Morgantina in the war against Syracuse, "urben Leontinorum capit."[6] From all of these passages it is seen very clearly that Morgantina was situated on the heights above Minae; but we cannot be equally

the only one, as far as I know, who on the basis of this passage recognizes that Morgantina "should be sought farther to the south than one generally supposes." Without giving reasons, Schubring (*Camarina* [Palermo, 1882], p. 21) advised the substitution of *Καταναίοις* for *Καμαριναίοις*.

[1] Even at the time of the second Athenian expedition, Thucydides (vi. 88) says of the inhabitants of Camarina: *τοῖς δὲ Συρακοσίοις ἀεὶ κατὰ τὸ ὅμορον διάφοροι.*

[2] Even a few years after the peace of Gela and before the second Athenian intervention, we find Camarina inclined toward an alliance with Leontini against Syracuse; see Thuc. v. 4; cf. for the following period the fact that from hatred of Dionysius the inhabitants of Camarina went to Leontini; Diod. xiii. 113.

[3] Diod. xi. 78. 5.

[4] Diod. xiv. 78. 7.

[5] This reference is connected with the fact that the slave conspiracy had its origin at the lake of the Palici; see Diod. xxxvi. 3.

[6] Iust. xxii. 2. 2.

certain as to whether it stood at Caltagirone, at Granmichele, or at some other neighboring place. From the statement of Thucydides, Caltagirone would seem to be excluded, for he says that Morgantina was an object of dispute between Syracuse and Camarina. The Syracusans, although giving up the possession of the land, wished that their rights of sovereignty be recognized by the payment of a sum by Camarina, their ancient colony. From this it seems to me evident that Morgantina, like Echetla, must have stood above some pass dominating the territory of Camarina and Leontini. It is certainly out of the question that Syracuse, which was then at the height of her power, should have ceded an inch of territory which really belonged to her. Nor does it seem possible that Morgantina stood on the site of modern Caltagirone, for the reason that the city which did stand there, as appears from its position, and as is stated explicitly in the passage from Callias,[1] belonged to the territory of Gela. Even before, in speaking of the conclusion of the peace of Gela, Thucydides says that previous to the meeting of the congress in that city the inhabitants of Camarina and Gela made a truce with each other only.[2] It seems that, if Morgantina had occupied the site of Caltagirone, it would not have been mentioned shortly after[3] in connection with the treaty between the Camarinaeans and Syracusans. Morgantina should, therefore, be sought on this plateau of the Heraeans, but farther to the east. In the museum of Syracuse my friend Paolo Orsi recently showed me a large collection of terracottas, of good Greek workmanship and of various periods, which, thanks to his untiring activity, he has succeeded in discovering at Terravecchia near Granmichele. Is it possible that Morgantina should be sought at that place?[4] The position of Terra-

[1] Callias apud Macrob. v. 19. 25; see above, p. 137, note 1. This passage is perfectly explained by supposing that Caltagirone marked the limit of the Geloan territory. Even in the case (which it is absurd to admit) that cordial relations existed between Gela and Syracuse, and that political reasons would have permitted the latter to dispose of the pass of Caltagirone, it is probable that the Camarinaeans would have tried to secure a safe passage in their own territory, rather than in that of Gela.

[2] Thuc. iv. 58.

[3] Thuc. iv. 65.

[4] Thuc. v. 4, in discussing the travels of the Athenian ambassador Pheax, who

vecchia and the references in the authors would favor such a supposition, and a continuation of the excavations may give a definite answer to the question.[1]

As far as I know, Galarina alone remains to be discussed. With no good reason, authorities from Cluver down have located it on the site of modern Gagliano, on the right bank of the Cyamosorus (Fiume Salso), opposite Agira, in the southern part of the island. Cluver, followed by more recent writers, gives weight to two references: one in Diodorus,[2] whose mention of this city

was endeavoring to rekindle, to the detriment of Syracuse, the war which had been ended by the peace of Gela, says that, after winning over the Agrigentines and Camarinaeans, he did not have the same success with the Geloans, and, thinking it useless to seek out the others (which ?), he returned to Catania by land through the country of the Siculi. On the way he exhorted the Leontini, who had taken refuge at Bricciniae, a fortress in the Leontine territory, to sustain their struggle against Syracuse. That Pheax, instead of going over the pass of Caltagirone to reach Geloan territory, went over either that of Granmichele or that of Vizzini, which led directly into the Leontine region, seems, if not certain, at least probable. Unfortunately, this gives no information concerning the position of Bricciniae, which may have been located much lower down, as, for example, at Casale di S. Basilio where several writers, following De Mauro, place it. The name Bricciniae seems entirely Greek; see Herond. *Mim.* ii. 57: ἐν Βρικίνδηροις; cf. the Βρικινδάριοι of Rhodes, *CIA*, I, 262, 1. 19; 262, 1.14.

[1] Leaving aside the passage in Plin. *N. H.* xxiv. 27, which, as is generally admitted, alludes to some maritime locality near Syracuse (the Μόργυνα of Philistus, or the Μεργάνη of Polybius ?), the other references to Morgantina are not sufficient to determine its location (see Diod. xix. 6; Cic. *Verr.* II. iii. 47, 103; Liv. xxiv. 36), although none of them contradicts in the least our hypothesis, and the reference in Livy rather favors it. It is more probable that the Romans during the siege of Syracuse would have had their granary near Caltagirone, which is famous for its grain supply, rather than in the distant territory of Mount Judica.

At Mount Judica, however, there must have been an ancient city. From Diod. iv. 80. 4 we learn that the temple of the *Matres* at Engyum was about 100 stades from Agyrium, and this circumstance, together with the fact that this cult was of Cretan (or Geloan) origin, leads me to think that Mount Judica, which was easily accessible to the Geloans by way of Caltagirone, may have been the site of Engyum. It is generally located, it is true, at Gangi, but this designation is in absolute contradiction to the distance in stades as given above, and does not suit the situation of this town, lost among the mountains, and only at a much later period accessible to Greek civilization. It is also wrong to place Engyum at Troina, as I once held; see my *Osserv. cit.*, p. 127, n. 2. At that place possibly Piacus was located; see above, chap. xi.

[2] Diod. xix. 104.

makes him think it was located near Centuripa, and one in Stephen of Byzantium, who (*s. v.*) calls it a colony of the Siculian Morges.[1] On the basis of the latter statement Cluver rightly decides that it should be sought not far from Morgantina, but, having wrongly located the one, he naturally erred in placing the other. Moreover, Cluver was influenced by the apparent resemblance between the names Galarina and Gagliano. The passage in Diodorus is too long to be quoted, but it seems to me that whoever makes a careful study, with no preconceived ideas, of chapters 102–4 of the nineteenth book of Diodorus, which speaks of the war of the Syracusan exiles against Agathocles, will find no more arguments for placing Galarina near Centuripa (which is mentioned just before) than for considering it to have been situated within the territory of Gela, of which mention is made directly after the reference to the taking of Galarina by the soldiers of Agathocles. On the other hand, the passage quoted from Stephen would induce us to place Galarina in Geloan territory, on one of the Heraean heights, since it is evident that, if Morgantina was the center of the Morgetes, one of the most ancient Italic peoples of the island, as ancient writers also held,[2] it is probable that Galarina, which was a colony of the legendary founder of Morgantina, should be sought in its neighborhood. I am confirmed in this hypothesis by the fact that Morgantina and Galarina are the only two cities in Siculian territory which from the beginning of the fifth century (before 480 B. C.) struck coins with Greek legends and types.[3] This could hardly be said of a city situated outside the sphere of action of the most ancient and powerful Greek colonies, and it forbids our placing Galarina at Gagliano; but it is explained, and fairly well at that, if we consider that Morgantina was in the center of a region which, thanks to its fertility and position, was rapidly conquered and civilized by the Leontini, Megarians, and Syracusans on the one hand, and by the Camarinaeans and Geloans on the other.[4] This fact

[1] Cluv., *Sic. Ant.* (ed. Lugd. Bat., 1619), pp. 330 ff. This opinion is held, for example, by Holm and by Freeman-Lupus; see the maps of these authors.

[2] Cf. Strab. v, p. 257 C.; vi, p. 270 C. [3] Head, *Hist. num.*, pp. 121, 137.

[4] I frankly confess that it seems to me absurd to place Galarina, a city which had its own coinage before 480 B. C., in such a rough and desert region, where civiliza-

makes it all the more probable that Galarina should be sought in the neighborhood of Morgantina; and since we have seen that Morgantina must in all probability have stood somewhere in the neighborhood of Granmichele, it seems right to suppose that Galarina should be sought, not to the east of this—for there, probably, was Echetla—but to the west, where Caltagirone stands, or else on the adjacent height of S. Mauro, since either place is favorable for the location of a fortified town, as Galarina certainly was.[1]

The supposition that Galarina occupied the now solitary and deserted site of S. Mauro is possibly favored by the Bacchic subject on the upper zone of our relief. If the relief, as it appears, is of architectural character, and formed part of some public monument, it should be noticed that Galarina is the only city of this region in which the cult of Dionysus is attested. Its archaic coins show the presence of such a cult, together with that of Zeus.

By this I do not mean to assert that we may be certain of the name of the city which occupied the height of S. Mauro, but, at any rate, the above observations show that among the Heraeans there existed a much more developed state of civilization than is generally admitted by modern writers, in opposition to the data furnished by ancient authors, and that several of the most ancient cities which are attributed to other regions should more probably

tion did not obtain a foothold till toward the middle of the fifth century at the time of Archonides and the final years of Ducetius, much later than it developed among the Heraean Mountains. There was no coinage in the region where Gagliano is now situated until a fairly late period. Agyrium alone commenced to coin money about 415 B. C., and it occupied a much more central position than the other cities of the district. It is also from about this period that we commence to have coins from Piacus, which seems to have stood in the region in which Gagliano is located. I naturally leave out Abacaenum, which had relations with the neighboring coast,and note that Centuripa and Herbita did not coin money till the fourth century B. C.

[1] That Galarina occupied a strong position appears, aside from the passage in Diod. xix. 104, already quoted, also from xvi. 67 of the same author, from which it may possibly be concluded that at the time of Timoleon it was one of the fortresses occupied by the Campanians.

be placed here.[1] Whether Mactorium rather than Galarina should be placed at S. Mauro, and whether Morgantina, which vied with Enna among the most famous Siculian cities of the Greek period, was located at Caltagirone rather than at Granmichele or Vizzini, it will be for future excavations to decide.

There is little hope, it is true, of discovering inscriptions bearing ethnical names. Sicily offers too barren a field, from an epigraphical point of view, to admit of our placing much reliance on such possibilities. Of much more assistance is the greater or less frequency with which local coin types come to light. These were certainly never widely distributed, and from places such as Galarina are very rare.[2]

The discovery of a relief of the technical excellence of the one we have just examined should give impetus to future excavations on the height of S. Mauro. The region seems fertile in every kind of antiquities,[3] and it would be of the greatest importance to discover other sculptured remains of the same nature. It is hardly conceivable that our relief was an isolated example and stood alone. It much more likely formed part of a temple or sacred inclosure. And since it is probable that the city which was situated on the height of S. Mauro soon disappeared, and

[1] Also Herbessus, as I have noted *Osserv. s. storia d. Sicilia* (Palermo, 1888), pp. 44 ff., must have been situated among the Heraeans, but rather more to the east. The corrupt passage in Vibius Sequester, "Herbesus quiet † Endrius oppido Alorino decurrit per fines Helori," together with the very rare coin ΕΡΒΗΣΣΙΝΩΝ, restruck over a coin of Syracuse, induces me to place it, if not at Buscemi, as I have already suggested, at least somewhere near this place, toward the summit of Mount Lauro, which commands the valley of the Tellaro (Helorus) and the other streams which descend into the territory of Leontini. The passage in Vibius shows clearly that Herbessus could not have been situated at Pantalica, in the center of the Anapo valley.

[2] Imhoof-Blumer, *op. cit.*, p. 18, knows of but three such coins.

[3] This results from the statements of Perticone (see above, p. 131, note 2), who (*op. cit.*, p. 21) speaks of the existence of walls, etc. His information is not accurate, and some of his data are open to criticism (see above, p. 131, note 4), but the presence of the relief in question shows that it is worthy of consideration and deserves verification. I might add that Professor Di Bernardi spoke of having brought from S. Mauro, and placed in the same garret with the relief, a fragment of an inscription, which at the time of my visit could not be found.

was succeeded on the opposite height by the Saracen Caltagirone, it is not extravagant to hope that under the soft clay-loam of the former, there are still concealed other precious remains of early Greek art.[1]

[1] As a result of the above article, Professor Orsi, director of the museum of Syracuse, made a summary exploration at S. Mauro; see *N. S.*, 1903, p. 432, where he also notes the adaptability of the region for purposes of defense, and the presence of material from the Stone Age on the plateau of Piano della Fiera. At S. Mauro Professor Orsi found traces of a temple, and noteworthy traces of a Greek settlement of the sixth century B. C. He has promised further excavations in that locality; see *Atti del Congr. internaz. di scienze storiche* (Rome, 1904), p. 179.

XIII

THE DEFEAT OF THE ATHENIANS AT THE ASSINARUS

In the immortal pages where Thucydides tells of the Athenian expedition against Syracuse, he describes clearly the road followed by the Athenians when, having been conquered in the naval battle and shut up in the harbor, they sought safety in flight by land. Having tried in vain to go up a valley leading to the Acraean height, and to gain the plateau beyond, they broke camp in the middle of the night, changed their course toward the sea, and at dawn reached the road leading to Helorus. This road they followed toward the river Cacyparis, hoping to ascend its valley, and thus to gain the plateau of Acrae.[1]

At the Cacyparis, instead of meeting the Siculi whom they were expecting, they fell in with the guard of the Syracusans. Through these they forced their way and, crossing the river, proceeded toward another river, called the Erineus. In the meantime Gylippus and the Syracusans had, about noon (*περὶ ἀρίστου ὥραν*, vii. 81), overtaken the rear guard of the fugitives, who were commanded by Demosthenes and were proceeding slowly and in disorder. After a struggle which lasted many hours (*δι' ἡμέρας*), Demosthenes and the Athenians to the number of 6,000, having been abandoned by a portion of their allies, capitulated, and were at once conducted to Syracuse. The front division, commanded by Nicias, had, on the other hand, proceeded rapidly and in good order, and was about six miles ahead when the rear guard was surprised by Gylippus. They continued to march till they reached the Erineus, where they camped on a height. Nicias, says Thucydides, thought that safety lay in hastening, in avoiding battle, and in retreating as rapidly as possible.[2]

On the following day Nicias was informed of the capitulation of Demosthenes, but did not believe it, and the day passed in

[1] Thuc. vii. 78–81.

[2] Thuc. vii. 81–83.

negotiations and skirmishes. The day after, Nicias gave orders to break camp early and to continue the march toward the Assinarus. This the Athenians were in haste to reach, both because they thought their troubles would be lessened after crossing the river (*οἰόμενοι ῥᾷόν τε σφίσιν ἔσεσθαι ἢν διαβῶσι τὸν ποταμόν*, 84), and because they were tired and thirsty. But no sooner did they reach the water than they broke ranks and rushed in, each man endeavoring to cross first and to quench his thirst. The Syracusans pressed them closely, and even crossed the river and hurled missiles upon them from the steep banks (*κρημνῶδες*) on the opposite side. The Athenian army was entirely defeated. Those who did not perish, or succeed in escaping, were taken prisoners and shut up in the quarries, where there were incarcerated 7,000 of the 40,000 who had attempted to escape; and of these the greater portion perished miserably from exposure and hunger.

Such, in brief, is the sad account as given by Thucydides.

The Helorine road, which the Athenians followed, is known, and we also recognize the river Cacyparis in the modern Cassabile. There is, on the other hand, some uncertainty concerning the Erineus and the Assinarus.

Holm, the most learned writer on ancient Sicilian history, and at the same time the author of the best topographical work on Syracuse, supposes that the Erineus was the torrent which today is dry, and is known by the name of the Cavallata, and that the Assinarus was the Falconara, or Fiume di Noto. He thus opposes the opinion of those, such as Leake, who identify the Erineus with the Falconara, and the Assinarus with the river which in antiquity was termed the Elorus and which is popularly called the Tellaro.[1]

The arguments of those who oppose Holm are as follows: Plutarch[2] says that, to perpetuate the memory of the victory at the Assinarus, the festival termed Assinaria was instituted. This

[1] Holm, *Geschichte Siciliens*, II, pp. 400 ff.; *Die Stadt Syrakus im Alterthum*, pp. 154 ff. I make use of the edition revised, with the author's consent, by Lupus, because it is more accessible to students than the rather costly and less common Italian edition published at needless expense by our minister of instruction.

[2] Plut. *Nic.* 28.

PLATE IV

Ancient Column near the Assinarus

is the same as the Ἑλώριος ἀγών of which Hesychius speaks,[1] and it was in remembrance of this festival that not far from the banks of the Helorus was placed the Greek column which still exists.[2] Holm responds by observing that it is not probable that the river Helorus, which was well known in antiquity, should also have been called Assinarus, and that this latter name appears only in the references to the defeat of the Athenians. He also notes that the column in question cannot be proved to be of that period, and that it is not near the Helorus, but between this (the Tellaro) and the Fiume di Noto or Falconara. He adds that the Falconara has the steep banks which Thucydides mentions as a characteristic of the Assinarus.

A few years ago, while planning to visit some of the places made famous by the pages of Thucydides, I decided to go over the road followed by the Athenians in their flight, and to see the two rivers and the place where the column is situated. The result of this excursion is the conviction that the Erineus is the Fiume di Noto, and the Assinarus the modern Tellaro. It also seems probable that the opinion of those who hold that the column was erected to recall the victory of the Syracusans is correct.

The first element to be studied before arriving at any definite conclusion is, of course, the text of Thucydides. We have seen that both the army of Demosthenes and the front division commanded by Nicias had crossed the Cacyparis, and that at about the hour of the midday meal Nicias was already 6 miles, or 50 stades, ahead of his colleague. Between the Cacyparis or Cassabile and the Cavallata the distance is about 67 stades; between the Cavallata and the Falconara about 13 stades.[3] At noon Nicias had to be at least 50 stades from the Cacyparis. If, then, the Erineus, where he arrived in the afternoon (toward evening?), were the Cavallata, he could not have gone more than 17 stades

[1] Hesych. ad v. Ἑλώριος ἀγών· τελούμενος ἐπὶ Ἑλώρου ποταμοῦ.

[2] Represented by Houel, *Voyage*, III, Plate 103. It is strange that in the *N. S.*, 1899, p. 242, Orsi should call this monument "almost unknown."

[3] For the distance in stades, and for the length of the stade in Thucydides, see Holm, *Die Stadt Syrakus*, p. 24, note.

(about 2 miles) in half a day. If the Erineus is the Falconara, he made something less than 30 stades ($3\frac{1}{2}$ miles). The army of Nicias was just as tired as that of Demosthenes, both having marched all night.[1] This explains to a certain extent only why it went so slowly during the second half of the day. But this is not enough. It may also be supposed that the crossing of the Erineus took some time, and that Nicias, having arrived at a valley which he proposed to ascend to arrive at the Acraean plateau inhabited by the allied Siculi, should have delayed, in order that the rear guard, of which he had received no news, might come up. The truth of this latter supposition is shown by the fact that on the following day Nicias would not believe the enemy when informed of the capitulation of Demosthenes.

From this it is evident that Nicias advanced slowly after the period of the noonday meal, and that the text of Thucydides does not offer sufficient data for deciding whether he encamped at the Cavallata or at the Falconara. Nevertheless, if it is considered that he had planned with Demosthenes to ascend the valley of the Cacyparis,[2] and was prevented from doing this by the Syracusans, it seems probable that he halted at the Erineus for the same purpose. Otherwise he would have gone much farther and, being anxious to escape quickly from danger,[3] would have marched all the afternoon. Thus he would have gone more than two miles, or more than three and a half miles, a distance which in a level country an army makes in an hour, even if—as was not certainly the case here—it is harassed by the enemy. A glance at a good orological and hydrographical map of the region shows that the only available way for Nicias to carry out his purpose was through the valley of the Falconara, which, just as that of the Cassabile, leads toward the plateau where Netum, the city of the Siculi, at some period was located.[4] It is also evident that in that region there are but three rivers, the Cassabile, the Falconara, and the Tellaro; i. e.,

[1] Thuc. vii. 81. 1. [2] Thuc. vii. 80. 5. [3] Thuc. vii. 81. 3.

[4] It is not certain that Netum stood there at the date in question, but such an important position from a strategic point of view had probably already been occupied by the Siculi, who were enemies of Syracuse and friends of the Athenians.

the three rivers which Thucydides names, the Cacyparis, the Erineus, and the Assinarus.

There is no reason, therefore, for identifying the Erineus with a dry torrent bed such as the Cavallata. It is true, as Holm notes, that according to Thucydides[1] the first autumn rains had fallen four days before the battle at the Assinarus (September 12, 413 B. C.).[2] It is also true, as is justly brought out by Holm, that the streams of Sicily have at present less water than in antiquity, on account both of earthquakes and the destruction of the forests. It should be noted, however, that the rains could not swell for a very long period a torrent less than five miles long, as was the Cavallata. Moreover, the destruction of the forests does not affect the region in question, because then, as now, it was planted with olives.[3]

Reference is also made to the festival termed Assinaria, which is quite possibly the Ἑλώριος ἀγών of Hesychius, since we know of no other victory gained by the Syracusans on the banks of the Helorus. We know, on the other hand, of a defeat which they there suffered when they were conquered by Hippocrates of Gela.[4] It is evident, however, that Gelo and Hiero of Gela, the tyrants of Syracuse, would not have undermined their well-known popularity by commemorating such a victory. They were anxious rather to have it forgotten that they came from Gela. Nor would the Syracusan democracy, after the expulsion of the Deinomenid Thrasybulus, have celebrated the victory of the powerful tryant from that city.

A still better proof that the Helorus and the Assinarus were the same river is the column which is situated not far from the Tellaro. It is a tall and beautiful Doric shaft, such as Syracuse may well have raised to commemorate a victory.[5] It is not exactly

[1] Thuc. vii. 79.

[2] For the date see Holm, *Die Stadt Syrakus*, p. 158. [3] Thuc. vii. 81. 4.

[4] Herodot. vii. 154; Sch. Pind. *Nem.* ix. 95.

[5] It is not constructed of superposed drums, as are the columns of the Doric temples of Selinus and Agrigentum, but of various pieces joined together and formerly covered with stucco. Moreover, it is not fluted, as Doric columns generally are. This does not prevent its being a fifth-century monument, since it is to be

on the Helorus, but is much nearer it than it is to the Falconara, being less than a mile from the former, and over two miles from the latter.[1] That it is not situated exactly on the banks of the Tellaro proves nothing. The battle—or, better yet, the slaughter—of the Assinarus took the name of the river for the reason that the last act of the drama took place at the river. But Thucydides[2] states clearly that the battle commenced at dawn, when Nicias moved from the banks of the Erineus in order to gain the Assinarus. The column therefore is situated near the river on the banks of which the battle ended, on a low plateau not far from the sea and dominating the adjacent mouth of the Helorus, and its position would confirm the account of Thucydides. Nevertheless, the lack of a good architectural study of this column, and of the other which is situated on the banks of the upper Tellaro at the place called Saccollino, forbids the definite acceptance of this argument. There exists also the possibility that the Athenians may have tried to cross the stream higher up to the west.

Moreover, it cannot be asserted that the banks of the Falconara only are steep. Those of the Tellaro, where it empties into the sea, on the side toward the column are in several places steep enough to explain the passage in Thucydides, as I was able to verify when I visited the region.[3]

considered more as a pedestal to bear a dedicated object, such as a tripod or a Nike, than as a column. By way of comparison it seems right to mention the high (4.60 m.) triangular base found at Olympia in 1875, which bore the Nike of Paeonius, and which was dedicated by the Messinians of Naupactus about 421 B. C. (see Paus. v.26. 1; Roehl, *Inscr. antiq.*, no. 348; *Ausgrabungen zu Olympia*, II, Plate 34). For the sepulchral character of the monument see the final note of this chapter.

[1] Holm-Lupus (*Die Stadt Syrakus*, p. 158) wrongly assert that the column stands between the Tellaro and the Fiume di Noto; cf. the map of the Italian *Stato Maggiore*, where the column, called today, as at the time of Fazello, *la Pizzuta*, is indicated. It is situated about half-way between the Tellaro and another small torrent farther to the north, the Laufi, a name already known to Fazello (see *Dec.* i. 4. 2), who also speaks of the column situated at the place called Saccollino.

[2] Thuc. vii. 84.

[3] I have on my side Pindar, who in speaking of the deeds of Chromius says (*Nem.* ix. 95): *βαθυκρήμνοισι δ' ἀμφ' ἀκταῖς Ἑλώρου.* Another argument in favor of my assertion is as follows: Thucydides (vii. 84. 1 f.) says that Nicias left the

There is not, therefore, sufficient reason for identifying the Erineus with the Cavallata, and the Assinarus with the Falconara. The probabilities are much more in favor of the supposition that the Falconara is the Erineus, and the Assinarus the same as the Helorus, the modern Tellaro.

Is it possible, however, that the river Helorus could also have had the name of Assinarus? Certainly it would not be the first case of one river having two names. It would take too long to enumerate all the rivers which either have changed their names, or have different names for different portions of their course. The Olbius, for example, was a river of Arcadia which certain Arcadians called the Aroanius.[1] At the time of Lysander a certain river of Thessaly was called the Hoplias, and at a later period the Isomantus.[2] One also naturally thinks of the Padus, which the Greeks called the Eridamus and the Ligurians the Bodincomagus.[3] The Danubius, too, was also called the Istrus, and at an early period was known as the Matoas.[4] The Eurotas near Tarentum is better known as the Galaesus.[5] The Tiber is said to have first been called the Albula.[6] According to Vibius Sequester, Faneus was another name for the Siris, and Titaressus for the Thessalian Orcus.[7] To take an example from Sicily itself, Heisterbegk[8] has shown that the river Sicanus was identical with the southern Himera. Even the Helorus had a third name, as we learn from Vibius Sequester,[9] who says: "Herbesos qui et † Endrius [i. e.

Erineus at dawn, and that when he arrived at the Assinarus the Athenians rushed into the river on account of their fatigue and thirst. The fact that the weather was still warm, and that the Athenians, being harassed by the Syracusans, had proceeded slowly for the 3½ miles between the two rivers, accounts for their thirst so shortly after breaking camp. This would be much less intelligible did we admit that they proceeded from the Cavallata to the Falconara, since these two streams are but a little over a mile apart.

[1] Paus. viii. 14. 3.

[2] Plut. *Lys.* 29. 8.

[3] Metrod. Sceps. apud Plin. *N. H.* iii. 122.

[4] Steph. Byz., s. v. Δάνουβις.

[5] Polyb. viii. 38. 8.

[6] Liv. i. 3; cf. the names of Rumon and Serra which are also given the Tiber in Serv. ad *Aen.* viii. 63.

[7] Vib. Seq., s. v.

[8] Heisterbegk, *Fragen der ältesten Geschichte Siciliens* (Berlin, 1869), pp. 45 ff.

[9] That there really was a river Herbessus is shown by the coins of the city of

Elorius] oppido Alorino [i. e. Elorino] decurrit per fines Elori." Fazello[1] tells us that at his time the lower course of the Tellaro was not called thus, but *Abisus*—a name in which it is not difficult to discover the ancient Herbessus, or the third name of the river. Two or even three names for the same stream are not surprising, if we consider that the Helorus, just as the others mentioned above, was a boundary river. The name "Helorus," which also belongs to the fortress at the mouth of the river, seems to be of Syracusan origin (cf. Ἑλώριος ἀγών and ὁδὸς Ἑλωριγή). Herbessus was certainly the name given it by the inhabitants of Hermessus who dwelt along its upper banks. The name "Assinarus" seems to indicate its marshy lower course, the "praepingue solum stagnantis Helori."[2]

According to a law which holds good for both ancient and modern times in Sicily, cities often derive their names from rivers which flow past them, and vice versa.[3] Moreover, the city of Helorus was not situated on the banks of the Tellaro, but on those of the neighboring Laufi, where Fazello (*loc. cit.*) saw many and conspicuous ruins, while at the mouth of the Tellaro was situated the fortress of Helorus, which is also mentioned by Pliny.[4] From these facts we are led to the conclusion that Helorus was originally the name of the small stream which today is called the Laufi, and

that name, on which the river is represented with the usual head and neck of an androcephalous bull (see Imhoof-Blumer, *Monnaies grecques*, p. 19, Plate A, Fig. 21). These coins still further prove, what I have elsewhere attempted to demonstrate (see *Alcune osserv. sulla storia e sulla amministr. d. Sicilia durante il dominio romano* [Palermo, 1888], pp. 46 ff., note), that Herbessus should not be sought, as it usually is, along the Anapo, or at Pantalica or Sortino, but rather opposite Acrae and near Buscemi, where the streams of the Anapus, and of the Herbessus or upper Helorus, take their origin.

[1] Fazello, *loc. cit.*: "et defluens pontem ipsum Bayhachemum, qui eius ripas utrimque colligat, abluit, et inde, neglecto priori nomine, Abisus adpellatus . . . . in mare illabitur." Cf. *supra* "Elorus fluvius . . . . Abisus hodie vulgo dictus."

[2] Verg. *Aen.* iii. 698. In the same way the Bacchiglione had one name near Vicetia and another near Patavium; cf. Nissen, *Italische Landeskunde*, II, p. 218.

[3] Heisterbegk, *Fragen der ältesten Geschichte Siciliens*, pp. 21 ff. Even today the Sicilian streams of this region are named from the neighboring cities, as Fiume di Noto, Fiume di Ragusa, Fiume di Scicli. The names "Assinaro" and "Ermininio," which figure on modern geographical maps, are of literary origin.

[4] Plin. *N. H.* xxxii. 16. It lay on a hill, today termed "Stambagi," where I picked up fragments of Greek pottery.

that, when the city spread from its banks as far as the mouth of the Tellaro, the name passed over to designate the mouth and lower course of that river, which there lost its earlier name of Assinarus.[1]

That the Tellaro is really the Assinarus the following argument makes still more probable, or even certain. During my visit to the valleys of the Tellaro and the neighboring streams I asked of every peasant I encountered the names of the rivers, knowing how little the map of the Italian *Stato Maggiore* is to be trusted in this regard. The peasants of the territory of Modica always asserted that the Tellaro was called *u Teḍḍaru*, while those of Noto, who dwell nearer the stream, constantly repeated the form *Atiḍḍaru*. This made me suspect that the name *Atiḍḍaru* has been wrongly interpreted by geographers and map-makers as *a Teḍḍaru*, or *il Tellaro*. A similar mistake was made by transcribing as *l'Amato* the name of the Calabrian river Lamato, the ancient Lametus, and today termed also Fiume di S. Ippolito. The form *l'Amato* unfortunately figures on many otherwise excellent maps.[2] It at once seemed evident to me that *Atiḍḍaru* was the Sicilian equivalent for the Ἀσσίναρος of Thucydides, and when I later came across the work of Fazello (*loc. cit.*), I noted with pleasure that he called the river *Atellarus*, a name which must henceforth be substituted for the other on geographical maps.[3]

[1] Only by admitting that the Helorus was originally identical with the Laufi can we explain the "undae clamosus Helorus" of Silius Italicus xiv. 269. See Fazello, *loc. cit.;* Cluver, *Sic. Ant.*, p. 185. On the map of the Italian *Stato Maggiore* the Laufi is termed *Elaro*, a name of obviously literary origin. Professor Mattia Di Martino, of Noto, writes that this name is unknown to the inhabitants there, who commonly term the stream *Ciumistieḍḍu* (*fiumicello*) *di Laufi*. See, however, the differing views on the Laufi advanced by my pupil and friend, Professor Ciaceri, "La disfatta degli Atenesi all' Assinaro," in my *Studi storici* (Pisa, 1904), III, pp. 345 ff.

[2] The river Lamatus in the Ionian form Λάμητος was already known to Hecataeus, fr. 40 (Müller, *F. H. G.*, I, p. 3). It is to be deplored that on the excellent map reduced from that of the Italian *Stato Maggiore* and published under the direction of Kiepert, the Falconara, which the peasants today term Fiume di Noto, is called the Asinaro.

[3] My learned friend, Professor Fumi, formerly my colleague in the University of Palermo, writes me as follows: "Ἀσσίνᾱρος seems to be Doric, and to mean a stream of mud (ἄσις, see *Il.* xxi. 321, possibly from ἀσσι=ἀσ-τι-: νᾶρο may be connected with the root *sna* and with νῆσος, etc.). It may be supposed that the

If, however, the Assinarus and the Helorus are identical, we must explain why the Helorus is continually mentioned by ancient writers, from Herodotus to Vergil, and yet when they speak of the river by the banks of which the slaughter of the Athenians occurred, they always give it the name of the Assinarus.

It is not difficult to explain this fact. Aside from Thucydides, the battle and the name of the Assinarus are recorded by Diodorus, Plutarch, and Pausanias. Diodorus had before him various historians, among others Thucydides; Plutarch consulted Thucydides and Philistus;[1] Pausanias, whether or not indirectly, as through Ptolemy, had before him Philistus, the well-known imitator of Thucydides.[2] In a word, the earliest and most authoritative historian of this war was consulted by all the later writers, including those of the Siceliots. The name "Helorus" was known to Thucydides (cf. ὁδὸς Ἑλωρινή), but since he calls the river where the defeat of the Athenians took place the Assinarus, and not the Helorus, all of his successors copied from him that name, even through they may have known that the river was also called the Helorus.[3]

reading in Thucydides is better" (Professor Fumi here refers to the form Ἀσίναρος, which occurs in our texts of Diod. xiii. 19; Plut. *Nic.* 27; and Paus. vii. 16. 5), "and that σσ was pronounced between the teeth, and later became ττ. The change from *n* to *l*, and from this to *d* (in Sicilian *ḍ* and *ḍḍ*), is obvious. Thus there is no doubt that the designation *Atiḍḍáru* used by the peasants of Noto is, with the customary acceptance of the long *vā*, the same as the ancient Ἀσσίναρος. The inhabitants of Modica change the first voiceless *a* to the article."

[1] For the relation between the accounts of Diodorus and Plutarch, and that of Thucydides, cf. the diligent observations of Holm, *Geschichte Siciliens*, II, pp. 341 ff., and especially for our case pp. 354 ff.

[2] That Pausanias, indirectly according to all probability, repeats data derived from Philistus in speaking of Sicilian affairs, is seen from an examination of the passages i. 13. 9; v. 23–6, and also i. 29. 12, where he mentions the events of this war, including the surrender of Demosthenes and Nicias; cf. Philist. fr. 46 in Müller, *F. H. G.*, I, p. 189.

[3] Since the above was written, trial excavations have been made by the Bureau of Excavations of Syracuse near the column in question; see *N. S.*, 1899, p. 242. These show clearly the sepulchral character of the monument. The tomb at the foot of the shaft is said to have been again employed for burial by a family of Helorus at a later period, about the time of Hiero II. The column may well have been erected in the fifth century to commemorate the dead who fell in battle.

XIV

THE PRETENDED EXPEDITION OF AGATHOCLES AGAINST ΦΟΙΝΙΚΗ

Among the stratagems of Agathocles Polyaenus[1] recounts an incident in which he is supposed to ask the Syracusans for two thousand soldiers, to enable him to accept an invitation from some who were seeking to put *Φοινίκη* into his hands.[2] The men were granted, but Agathocles, when he had received what he desired, took no more heed of *Φοινίκη*,[3] but went off to take certain fortresses near Tauromenium.

At first sight it would seem as if Polyaenus meant to speak of a maritime exepdition of Agathocles against the Phoenicians. Droysen,[4] however, thought differently, and advanced the hypothesis, which was also accepted by Holm,[5] that we have here to deal neither with the Phoenicians nor with the island Phoenicusa of the Aeolian group, but with *Φοινίκη*, the Epirote city opposite Corcyra, and that the incident refers to the expedition which Agathocles made to Corcyra in 300 B. C. at the time when he defeated the Macedonians led by Cassander.[6] In his history of Agathocles Schubert opposes this hypothesis, which seems to him untenable:

> Aside from other improbabilities, from grammatical reasons alone . . . . since as the name of a city the word *Φοινίκη* would not have the article, and the inhabitants of a city named *Φοινίκη* could not bear the name of *Φοίνικες*. Apparently Polyaenus found in his sources that Agathocles had spoken of an expedition against the *Φοίνικες* (i. e., Carthaginians), and, in his haste, after the word *διαβησόμενος* falsely construed the name of the country from *Φοίνικες*.[7]

Since Schubert himself was obliged to admit that Polyaenus

[1] Polyaen. v. 3. 6.

[2] Polyaen. *ibid.*: *ὡς διαβησόμενος ἐς τὴν Φοινίκην, φάσκων τῶν ἐκεῖ τινὰς προδιδόντας μετὰ σπουδῆς αὐτὸν καλεῖν.*

[3] *Ibid.*: *Φοίνιξι μὲν μακρὰν χαίρειν ἔφη.*

[4] Droysen, *Histoire de l'Hellénisme* (Paris, 1883), II, p. 532, n. 1 *a*.

[5] Holm, *Geschichte Siciliens*, II, p. 479.

[6] Diod. xxi. 2.

[7] Schubert, *Geschichte des Agathokles* (Breslau, 1887), pp. 200 f.

did not faithfully repeat his source, and that he created the form Φοινίκη, I do not see why one might not consider that some other like mistake was made, as, for example, that the author of the stratagems may have confused the Epirote city Φοινίκη with the Asiatic region, and have added the word Φοίνικες on his own initiative. However, that in this passage the Epirote city is not meant is evident. When, after the expedition to Africa, Agathocles undertook the war against the peoples of Magna Graecia and against Corcyra, he was *king*. He was master of half of Sicily and had entire control over the destinies of Syracuse. He also had at his disposal an excellent army, composed for the most part of mercenaries whom he enrolled at his pleasure according to the amount of money at his disposal or which he promised,[1] and had no need of resorting to pretexts for demanding two thousand soldiers of the Syracusans, nor reason for concealing the real enemy whom he proposed to attack. It is evident—and it is strange that the historians of Agathocles have overlooked this fact—that the statement of Polyaenus refers to the period of his life which either preceded or was but slightly later than his being made στρατηγός (317 B. C.), a time when he was not as yet absolute master of the lives and property of the Syracusans.[2]

The hypothesis advanced by Schubert that Polyaenus alludes to an expedition against the Carthaginians is at first sight plausible. An examination of the words φάσκων τῶν ἐκεῖ τινὰς προδιδόντας μετὰ σπουδῆς αὐτὸν καλεῖν, however, shows clearly enough that the sources of Polyaenus made mention, not of a region, nor of Φοίνικες, but of a city or fortress which Agathocles said would be handed over by traitors. It seems to me that the solution of our problem is made easy from every standpoint if we admit that Polyaenus found in his sources the statement that Agathocles pretended to have been summoned by traitors of the maritime city of Φοῖνιξ. As is seen from Appian and the Itineraries, this city was situated not far from Cape Coccynus, about twenty miles north of Tauromenium,[3] the fortress against which the attack of

[1] Diod. xxi. 2. 2, 3. [2] Diod. xix. 5 f.

[3] That the Φοῖνιξ of Appian (*B. C.* v. 110) is the same as the Palma or Tama-

Agathocles was really directed. The change between Φοῖνιξ and Φοίνικες is not difficult to explain, and, having once occurred, and it being understood whence the meaning of the word and of the narration was derived, one understands how the reference to an expedition of Agathocles against τὴν Φοινίκην was made possible.[1] I am not able, nor do I wish, to decide whether the error is due to Polyaenus, or whether he derived it from his direct source. In this connection various hypotheses might be evolved, all of them probable, but none of them certain.

It is needless to insist on the fact that the hypothesis which holds that the Φοῖνιξ near Tauromenium is meant, is quite probable, and that from a historical and geographical point of view it at least appears much better than the others mentioned above. I prefer instead to discover the approximate date of the expedition against the territory of Tauromenium, and to find out why Agathocles concealed the real end which he had in view.

From lack of data it is impossible to establish the *terminus ante quem*. It may merely be noted that, after Sosistratus had returned to Syracuse only to be driven forth, Agathocles, according to Diodorus ποτὲ μὲν ἰδιώτης ὤν, πότε δὲ ἐφ' ἡγεμονίας τεταγμένος, sought every occasion to push himself forward, and to show, as before the walls of Gela, his strategic capacity.[2] This all came about after Agathocles had attempted to seize Croton and Tarentum, and had aided Regium when besieged by Heraclides and by Sosistratus, and before the return of the petty tyrant to Syracuse. If we bring into relation the aid which Syracuse sent Croton, the more or less disinterested services which Agathocles rendered the cities of Magna Graecia, and also the expedition of Alexander of Epirus, in favor of these same cities, and against the Brettians and Lucanians (c. 335–331 B. C.), we come to the conclusion that Agathocles,

ricium of the Itineraries was noted first by Corcia, *Storia d. due Sicilie* (Naples, 1852), IV, p. 88, and then by Holm, *Beiträge zur Berichtigung der Karte des alten Siciliens* (Lübeck, 1866), Praef. p. 11.

[1] Certainly in the first sources the inhabitants of Φοῖνιξ were not recorded as Φοίνικες. According to Siceliot analogy as brought out, e. g., by Steph. Byz. (s. v. Ἀβακαῖνον), the derived form would be Φοινικῖνος.

[2] Diod. xix. 4.

who was born about 361 B. C.,[1] held the office of general toward 330 B. C., when he was about thirty years of age. It is impossible, however, to determine accurately the date of the relations of Syracuse with these cities, or to verify that which it is merely possible to surmise; namely, that there was some relation between the aid sent by Syracuse to Croton and the expedition of Alexander of Epirus. In any case, the results attained are very indefinite. It may be, however, that Syracuse fought in favor of Croton even after the battle of Pandosia in which Alexander perished (c. 331 B. C.).

We are led to less vague conclusions by the statement of Eusebius (version of Hieronymus), who says that in 323 B. C.: "Agathocles Syracusis tyrannidem exercet."[2] Diodorus, on the other hand, states that Agathocles obtained control over Syracuse in 317 B. C.[3] It may be that in this case Hieronymus and Syncellus were mistaken, and that we have here one of the common cases where two numerals, such as CXIV.II and CXV.IIII, were confused. It is possible, however, that Hieronymus here indicates the date when Agathocles first obtained control of public affairs, even if but for a short time and with powers not clearly defined.[4]

When driven out by Sosistratus, Agathocles went to Morgantium; but shortly afterward, with the consent of the Carthaginian leader Hamilcar, he succeeded in returning to Syracuse, and in being recognized as general by the new democratic government.[5] Not even then, however, was he able to consider himself as absolute master, on account of the power of the optimates. To succeed in having an army which would be trustworthy and ready to carry out any orders whatever, he concealed from the citizens his real designs and told them that he had been given to understand that the rebels had been assembling forces at Herbita, a city situated in the central part of the island. He pretended to make an

[1] Diod. xxi. 16. 5; cf. Schubert, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

[2] Eus., ed. Schoene, II, p. 117. This date is not even discussed by Holm and Schubert.

[3] Diod. xix. 5.

[4] See Iust. xxii. 1: "Bis occupare imperium Syracusarum voluit, bis in exilium actus est." For the meaning of these words see Schubert, *op. cit.*, p. 44.

[5] About 317 B. C.; see Diod. xix. 5; Iust. xxii. 2.

expedition against Herbita, but in reality assembled from Morgantium, and from other friendly or allied cities, the sold ers who at his command were to kill the citizens, either because they were rich, or because they were adverse to his absolute government.[1]

From that period on, Agathocles was really master of Syracuse, and, having no longer to render an account of his actions to anyone, he commenced to assail openly the neighboring cities, whether friendly or hostile, and at times even those which were relying on their alliance with Carthage.[2]

The action of Agathocles in the case of the expedition against Herbita recalls vividly that which, either then or in the past, he had taken in regard to Tauromenium. If that city did not recognize his dominion as a result of the treaty of 314 B. C.,[3] it at least fell into his hands together with Messana in 312.[4]

That the assault on the fortress in the territory of Tauromenium took place by sea is easily explained by an examination of the geographical and strategical position of Tauromenium itself. Moreover, other similar unforeseen marine assaults on the part of Agathocles are attested as having occurred against Messana and Mylae.[5] The reason for his concealing the fact that the attack was in reality directed against Tauromenium is given by Polyaenus himself; i. e., because the inhabitants of Tauromenium were allies. When the Corinthian Timoleon, having overcome the obstacles placed in his way by the Carthaginians, succeeded in setting foot in Sicily, it was Andromachus, the father of the historian Timaeus, who received him at Tauromenium, which he had recently founded. With that place as a starting-point, Timoleon succeeded in freeing Syracuse from the tyrants. According to Diodorus, or rather Timaeus, Andromachus aided the undertaking of Timoleon because he was well disposed toward Syracuse.[6]

The good relations between the two cities evidently lasted for several decades, and the reason for this is to be sought in the origin of the inhabitants of Tauromenium. According to Dio-

[1] Diod. xix. 9 f.; Polyaen. v. 3. 7; 8; Iust. xxii. 2.

[2] Diod. xix. 9; 65 f.; Iust. xxii. 3.

[3] Diod. xix. 72.

[4] Diod. xix. 102.

[5] Diod. xix. 65.

[6] Diod. xvi. 68; 345 B. C.

dorus,[1] Tauromenium, having been taken from the Siculi and made a colony of Syracuse by Dionysius I, received through Andromachus the ancient Naxians whom Dionysius I had driven from their native town.[2] How was it possible, however, for Andromachus, who had founded a city of the ancient Naxians, to favor Syracuse, of which city the Naxians had always been the fiercest of enemies? We are not surprised that Diodorus does not find it necessary to explain this contradiction.

The earliest coins of Tauromenium, of about the time of Andromachus, have the Doric legends ΑΡΧΑΓΕΤΑΣ and ΤΑΥΡΟΜΕΝΙΤΑΝ,[3] and the official language in the inscriptions is also Doric.[4] Moreover, Andromachus was well disposed toward Syracuse, and his son, the historian Timaeus, was called a Syracusan by the Sicilian Diodorus.[5] From these facts we should perhaps conclude, not only that the base of the population of Tauromenium was Doric, as has, of course, already been observed, but also that it had been founded by Syracusans who differed from the policy of the Dionysii. Andromachus founded, or rather reconstituted, Tauromenium in 358 B. C., at the commencement of the revolution which was to put an end to the tyranny of the second Dionysius.[6] If this theory is correct, and Tauromenium was really an offshoot of Syracuse, we understand better why the Romans, in addition to handing over to Hiero II the possessions of Acrae, Netum, Helorus, Megara, and Leontini, all of which were near Syracuse, and had been conquered by her centuries before, should also have granted him Tauromenium, notwithstanding the fact that between it and the territory of Hiero were Catana and the Roman province, and that the strategic position of Tauromenium should have counseled the Romans not to allow it to fall into the hands of others.[7]

[1] Diod. xiv. 96; cf. 59, 86; 396 B. C.

[2] Diod. xvi. 7; 358 B. C.

[3] See Head, *op. cit.*, p. 165.

[4] E. g., Kaibel, *Inscr. Gr. Sic. et It.*, No. 434: ὁ δᾶμος τῶν Ταυρομενιτᾶν . . . .

[5] Diod. xvi. 16. 5.

[6] Holm (*Gesch. Sic.*, II, p. 438) thinks Tauromenium was inhabited by a population of mixed Doric and Ionic elements (and among these also the Zanclaeans), and that the Doric dialect was in official use, because at the time of the founding of the city the influence of Syracuse in Sicily was preponderant.

[7] See Diod. xxiii. 4. 1; cf. Athen. v. 208 f.

XV

THE DAUNIANS AND UMBRIANS OF CAMPANIA

In describing the extent of Campania, and the peoples who inhabited it, Polybius first mentions the inhabitants of the cities on the coast, such as Sinuessa, Cumae, Dicaearchia, Naples, and Nucera, and those dwelling in the interior at Cales and Teanum, and then, before describing Capua, the most important city of the plain, says that the region lying to the east and south was occupied by the *Δαύνοι καὶ Νωλανοί*.[1]

Who these Daunians were has often been asked, but with no success. It has been supposed that the text of Polybius is corrupt, and Holstenius, among others, proposed to correct the word *Δαύνοι* to *Καυδίνοι*, while others, such as Schäfer, have suggested the reading *Καλατῖνοι*. Neither from a paleographical nor from a geographical standpoint is either of these two changes entirely satisfactory. Caudium did not belong to Campania, but to the region of the Hirpini in Samnium,[2] and the fact that it was situated beyond the mountains which surrounded Campania would seem to preclude its being considered in this connection, especially since Polybius, who was describing rather the geographical than the political characteristics of the country, alludes expressly to the numerous and continuous mountains which surround and isolate the Campanian plain.[3]

From a geographical standpoint the correction to *Καλατῖνοι* has greater probability, but it is paleographically incorrect. Upon close examination still other corrections suggest themselves, although no one of them seems convincing enough to warrant its acceptance. Thus, for example, instead of the words ΠΡΟC . . . .

[1] Polyb. ii. 91. 4 f.

[2] Plin. *N. H.* iii. 11. 105; Liv. xxiii. 41. 13: *Samnites Caudinos.* Also Ptol. iii. 1. 58 places it in the country of the Samnites. There is nothing definite to be derived from Strab. v, p. 249 C.; vi, p. 283 C.

[3] Polyb. ii. 91. 8: *τὸ δὲ πλεῖον ὄρεσι μεγάλοις πάντῃ καὶ συνεχέσι περιέχεται.*

ΜΕCΗΜΒΡΙΑΝ ΔΑΥΝΙΟΙ it might seem better to read ΠΡΟC ΜΕCΗΜΒΡΙΑΝ ΑΒΕΛΛΑΝΟΙ, since the most ancient Abella was not only situated in Campania, but was near the city of Nola, as would be shown, were other proof lacking, by the famous cippus of Abella alone. It should be remembered that in his list Polybius records one after the other, cities which were situated near each other, or even close together, such as Cales and Teanum, Cumae and Dicaearchia, and Dicaearchia and Naples.

It seems to me, however, that there is no need of changing the text. The mere fact that the Daunians whom Polybius mentions are not known to us offers no excuse for such a change. An examination of the coins of Campania shows a series of cities which are not mentioned in the texts, and the location of which both numismatists and geographers have in vain endeavored to determine. About the middle of the fourth century there existed in the central part of the Campanian plain the cities of Alipha, Phistelia, Alliba, and Hyria. In the following century we find others, such as Irthne, which is also unknown. For certain of these coins probable and ingenious conjectures have been made, but in nearly all cases they are conjectures which may be accepted or refuted, according to the point of view taken by the critic. There are, for example, scholars who attribute certain of these coins to cities on the coast, while still others have thought to have plausible reasons for assigning the same coins to regions which are situated beyond the bounds of Campania. Thus certain numismatists, such as Head, have located Alipha and Phistelia near Cumae, while others more recently have identified them with Allifae and other regions of Samnium.[1] In like manner ancient texts speak of Samnite or Campanian cities of which we find no trace in the coins or authors of the second century of the Republic. During the wars of the fourth and third centuries B. C., certain cities disappeared. Aurunca, of which city we have coins dating from the fourth century, is said to have been destroyed in 337 by the Sidicini.[2] Of Vescia, too,

[1] Head, *Hist. num.*, pp. 26, 35; cf. Dressel apud A. Sambon, *Les monnaies antiques de l'Italie* (Paris, 1904), pp. 320, 329.

[2] Liv. viii. 15. 2. Mommsen in the *CIL*, X, p. 465 (whom I follow in my

we have no information, and it is quite possible that certain of the names mentioned by Diodorus for the period of the Samnite wars do not imply a corrupt text, but recall localities which during that struggle either entirely disappeared, or else became insignificant villages, unworthy of being included in works on political and administrative geography.[1]

It may be objected in the present instance that Polybius wrote after these wars were ended, and alludes, not to obscure and unknown cities, but to the most important localities of Campania. He mentions the inhabitants of Suessa and Cumae, of Dicaearchia and Naples, and also the Daunii, Nolani and Nucerini. Under the name of *τῶν Νουκερίνων ἔθνος* he includes a series of peoples who recognized Nucera as their metropolis. In this manner Polybius avoids mentioning the various seats of the Sarrastes, the localities on the Sorrentine peninsula, and Pompeii itself.[2] He alludes to Capua by itself, and either does not take occasion or had no intention to refer to Casilinum, Volturnum, Atella, and Suessula. He speaks of Naples, but not of the localities which recognized the hegemony, or even the dominion, of that city. It may well be that under the name of Daunians he alludes to a people dwelling on the borders of, or not far distant from, the territory of Nola, in the southeastern portion of Campania, in the neighborhood of the buttresses of the Apennines which bound the Campanian plain in that direction.

This conclusion would seem to be strengthened by the fact that the mention of the Daunians is not, so to to speak, a *ἅπαξ λεγόμενον* of Campania, but occurs elsewhere as well. Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in speaking of the important expedition which in 524 B. C., was made against Cumae by the Etruscans, says that to these were united *Ὀμβρικοί τε καὶ Δαύνιοι, καὶ συχνοὶ τῶν ἄλλων βαρβάρων*.[3] For several decades numerous visible traces

Storia di Roma, I, 2, p. 246) believes that Aurunca is the same as Suessa Aurunca. See, however, the observations of Garrucci, *Monete dell' Italia ant.*, p. 78, in regard to the ruins of Croce di Rocca Monfina.

[1] See the discussion of this in my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, pp. 398 ff.

[2] Concerning the *ἔθνος τῶν Νουκερίνων* I accept the observations of Beloch, *Campanien*, p. 240.

[3] Dion. Hal. vii. 3.

of these Etruscans remained in Campania, and according to Polybius and Strabo they founded there twelve cities.[1] Moreover, Herculaneum and Pompeii fell into their hands,[2] and it was not until about 424 B. C., or the years immediately following, that, according to the chronology of Livy, they were forced by the Samnites to give up their possession of Capua and Cumae.[3] Even of their allies some traces were left, because, as we learn from Pliny, the Umbrians were among the peoples that ruled over Campania. These are mentioned after the Greeks and together with the Etruscans, but before the Campanians.[4] The Umbrians are also recorded by Strabo when he enumerates the various peoples that conquered Campania.[5]

It is quite possible that the memory of these Umbrians endured in the name of Nuceria Alfaterna, since Nuceria was also the name of a city situated in the center of Umbria; nor is such an ethnical attribution opposed by the fact that a historian of the fourth century spoke of Noucria or Nuceria as a Tyrrhenian or Etruscan city.[6] We know from Strabo and Pliny that the Etruscans pushed as far as the modern Salerno and the plain of Picentum, which is bounded by the Sele and traversed by the stream which is still termed Tusciano.[7] Moreover, it should not be forgotten that the

[1] Polyb. ii. 17; Strab. v, p. 242 C.

[2] Strab. v, p. 247 C.

[3] Liv. iv. 37. 44; cf. Diod. xii. 31. 76; for 438 and 421 B. C.

[4] Plin. *N. H.* iii. 60.

[5] I regard as certain the emendation of Beloch to Strab. v, p. 242 C., where in place of Ὀσκων τὸ ἔθνος, which is meaningless, he reads Ὀμβρικῶν.

[6] Philist. apud Steph. Byz., s. v. Νουκρία.

[7] In addition to the remarks in my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, p. 522, it may be noted that a possible allusion to the Etruscan domination in the region near the Silarus is preserved in the mention of the colony of Cosa, near Paestum (see Liv. xxvii. 10. 8; cf. Vell. i. 14. 7), which, according to certain texts of Velleius, is perhaps mentioned as being in a region not very far distant from Herculaneum and Pompeii (ii. 16). It seems to me probable that the colony of Cosa, which was founded at the same time as Paestum, instead of being in the immediate neighborhood of Pompeii, as certain critics have thought, was located in the region above Paestum, not far from the Sele and on the edge of the wood of Persano, where there still exists a locality termed *la Cosa*. It is by no means unusual to find two Roman colonies in close juxtaposition and united for strategic purposes. A close parallel exists in the case of Sinuessa and Minturnae, which were founded in 295 B. C.,

Umbrians, Daunians, and other barbarians figure as allies of the Etruscans.

If, however, the statement of Dionysius is confirmed as far as the Etruscans and Umbrians are concerned, why should we doubt it in the case of the Daunians and other barbarian peoples? It is hardly possible that the Daunians who came to Campania with the Etruscans and Umbrians were the inhabitants of Daunia, the modern Capitanata where Foggia is situated. They were rather, as everything leads us to believe, a branch of this people. From ancient writers we learn that the Daunians were of the important Iapygian stock which gave its name to the whole of Apulia, and which in the fourth century still occupied a territory extending as far as Mount Orion or Garganus and the borders of Samnium. From this it is clear why the Iapygian-Daunians united themselves with the Umbrians. As we learn from the *Tabulae Iguvinae*, there were in the direction of the Adriatic coast several neighboring tribes of Iapygian descent which were hostile to the Umbrians.[1]

It does not seem possible to understand the problem of the origin of the Daunians without taking into consideration the passages in Vergil in which the Rutulians of Ardea are termed *Daunii*, and their king, Turnus, is called *Daunius*, because he was the son of Daunus. If in this passage Vergil reproduces his sources with his customary faithfulness, it follows that the Daunians also occupied some portion of the earliest Latium, and we understand better the fact that they are found with the Etruscans, when that people, after invading and conquering Latium about the second half of the sixth century, pushed as far as the Campanian plain, which they

and also in the case of Placentia and Cremona, both of which date from 218 B. C.

As I stated in an oral contribution at the meeting of the Accad. di Arch. Napol., April 5, 1901, I would attribute to the Cosa near Paestum the coins of the Campanian type with the legend COϟANO, which Garrucci (p. 74) and Dressel (*Beschreibung der antiken Münzen* [Berlin, 1894], III, 1, p. 34) attribute to Cosa Volcientium, and which Head (*op. cit.*, p. 25) is disposed to assign to Compsa in Samnium. The name of the Cosa near the Silarus, and not far from Lucanian Volceium, would naturally seem to suggest the Etruscan Cosa Volcentium.

[1] *Tab. Iguv.* vi. 6. 54 f.; vii. a. 12. 47 f.; cf. the *Dolates cognomine Sallentini* in Plin. *N. H.* iii. 112.

held until the invasion of the Samnite Campanians in the fifth century.[1] Nothing opposes the conclusion that the Iapygian Daunians established themselves in Campania in the same manner as did their allies, and the mention of the Δαύνιοι in Polybius causes one to believe that they occupied some portion of that fertile region.

The above observations are confirmed by another passage which has not been generally understood, and which, so far as I know, has never been made use of in this connection, although it makes mention of the Daunians in a region which must have belonged to Campania. This passage is found in the collection of amorous narrations which was dedicated to Cornelius Gallus by Parthenius, the teacher of Vergil. One of these tales deals with the story of a certain Calchus, king of the Daunians, who became enamored of Circe and offered her his realm. After the arrival of Ulysses, however, he was transformed by her enchantments into a swine. The Daunians, alarmed at the nonappearance of their king, set out to find him, and betook themselves to Circe, who promised to restore him on the condition that he never return to her island.[2]

The scholars who have examined this account have generally seen in it an allusion to a local hero of Daunia, the modern Capitanata. And since the seer Calchas was honored in that region on Mount Garganus, and since Pliny states that the Lucanians were subdued by him, they have come to the conclusion that the local hero Calchus was transformed by the Greeks into the Greek Calchas.[3] This conclusion, however, is entirely false and arbitrary.

[1] For Daunus, the father of Turnus, and for the Rutulians termed Daunians, see Verg. viii. 146; x. 616; xii. 723. See, however, the myth of Turnus descended from Danae (vii. 372, and cf. Serv. *ad loc.*), and cf. Stoll s. v. "Danae" in Roscher. The difference between the two myths is naturally explained as an adaptation of a tradition of Italic origin to Greek legends. The Latin Messapus (Verg. vii. 691; viii. 6; ix. 27, 124, 523; x. 354) is possibly a localization of the eponymous Sallentinus (see Serv. ad *Aen.* vii. 691), or else may represent the transformation to Messapus of some Iapygio-Daunian hero of Latium.

[2] Parth. 12.

[3] See Stoll and Immisch, s. v. "Kalchas" in Roscher, II, 1, col. 923. They are followed by Beloch in *Hermes* XXIX (1894), p. 606.

The hero Calchas who was honored on Mount Garganus, and who conquered the Leucanians or Lucanians of Leuceria or Lucera, was a Greek hero who had originally nothing to do with the Daunians of the Capitanata. This is shown by the fact that his cult was there united with that of Podalirius, whose tomb was also shown at the foot of the same mountain. According to certain traditions, Calchas and Podalirius returned on foot from Troy. Still other versions state that this was accomplished by Calchas in company with Mopsus.[1] With this is possibly connected the mention of the Mopsians in the region of the upper Ofanto, the river which empties into Daunian territory. These myths of Argive origin, and localized especially in Pamphylia, Cilicia, and Rhodian Phaselis, are connected with the existence near Mount Garganus of the colony of Elpie or Salapia, founded by Coans of Argive-Rhodian origin.[2] Calchus is therefore a hero of Italian Daunia. He has nothing in common with the Greek Calchas, and his seat could not have been in eastern Daunia or Capitanata.

It is difficult to see just what could have suggested such relations between Circe and Daunia, although the way in which she became connected with the Latins and Marsians is evident. From the fifth century at least, Rome and Latium had been closely connected with Circeii, and it was natural that the cult of the eponymous goddess of that city should have assumed a place among their myths. The Latin divinity Picus was made the husband of Circe, and Latinus himself her son. In like manner the Mamilii of Tusculum thought themselves descended from Ulysses and the famous enchantress.[3] The fact that the Marsians believed themselves descendants of a son of Circe is explained by the custom,

[1] See my statements concerning the Greek colonies of the Adriatic in my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, pp. 574 ff.; cf. the commentary of E. Ciaceri on the *Alexandra* of Lycophron (Catania, 1901), pp. 296 ff.

[2] For Mopsus see the article of Höfer in Roscher, II, 2, cols. 3007 ff., and Ciaceri, *op. cit.*, p. 195 for vs. 439. With the cult of Mopsus seems to me to be connected the name of the Mopsii, a political division of the Hirpinan Compsa beside the upper Ofanto (Liv. xxxiii. 1).

[3] Pseud.-Scymn., vs. 228; Liv. i. 49; Verg. vii. 190; cf. Steph. Byz., s. vv. Ἄρδεα, Ἄντεια, Πραίνεστος.

which still prevails among the natives of the province of Abruzzo and the central Apennine region, of passing through the valley of the Liris and over the pass of Fabrateria (Ceccano) to spend the winter in the Pomptine marshes and at Terracina.[1]

On the other hand, neither political nor commercial relations united the island of Circe to the distant Daunia, which was situated on another sea, and was separated from Circeii by a range of lofty mountains. In all probability the legend refers, not to a hero of the Capitanata who offers to Circe his realm, but to the king of some region in the neighborhood of the island of the enchantress. And since we know from Dionysius that the Daunian barbarians attacked Campania with the Etruscans, and since Polybius mentions the presence of Daunia in that region, it seems probable that the myth related by Parthenius embraces a later allusion to this people.

It now remains to determine, if possible, the exact location of the Daunians as compared with that of the neighboring Nolans. Were they situated to the north or to the south of Nola, and on the plain or on the slopes of the adjacent mountains inhabited by the Hirpini? And what cities were under their control? Polybius offers no further assistance in determining their location. In enumerating the cities of northern Campania he first speaks of Cales, which is situated to the south of Teanum, the city which is next mentioned. This shows that from his statement it is impossible to decide whether the Daunians were situated more to the south or to the east of the Nolans. Nor is there any aid to be derived from the other literary or monumental sources, since there is nowhere mention of the *fines* of the Hyrienses, who, as we shall see, were probably subject to the Daunians. This is brought out by Fiorelli in one of his plates illustrating the results obtained by the Latin gromatics.[2]

[1] Plin. *N. H.* vii. 15; xxv. 11; Gell. *N. A.* xvi. 11.

[2] See Lachmann, *Gromatici veteres*, Plate 24, Fig. 197 *a*, ad Hyg. *De limit. constit.*, I, p. 204. On this plate, near an *oppidum atellae* and a *via consularis* we read *fines hirrensium*, and the same words are repeated a short distance away. This led Fiorelli (*Annali numismatici*, I, 33, apud Garrucci, *Mon. dell' Italia antica*, p. 92) to place the above-mentioned Hyrienses in Campania (cf also A. Sambon

Since there is little assistance to be derived from the texts, and since there are no inscriptions bearing on the question, we must have recourse to the coins and to topography, which throw a light upon the subject which, though faint, is not to be despised. An examination of the names found in eastern Daunia shows that certain of them have an Osco-Italian character similar to those of Campania. This is easily explained when one considers the presence on the Adriatic coast also of the early Ausonian Oscans. Even at the time of Pseudo-Scylax the Opicians were found in that region, and it was there that the successive invasions of the Piceni and the other peoples of Italico-Samnite descent occurred.[1] As a result of such Italic influence we find the name "Teanum" or "Teate" both in Campania and in Capitanata. If, on the other hand, we seek traces in Campania of the names of the Iapygian stock which occupied eastern Daunia, we come across the name of the Urietes, the inhabitants of Hyria or Uria, which calls to mind the Uria on the slopes of Mount Garganus, a mountain which in the fourth century B. C., was itself called Orion.

It has already been noticed that the name of Hyria or Uria is characteristic of the Iapygian race, and had less connection with that of the Daunians in question.[2] It is true that the same name is found in certain regions of Greece and Asia Minor,[3] but it occurs

Les monnaies antiques de l'Italie, I, p. 203). This identification, however, is erroneous. Fiorelli supposes that the *colonia Augusta* which was separated from the *oppidum atellae* by the *via consularis* was Capua, but between the two localities is a *mons* which certainly does not exist in the center of the Campanian plain. Moreover, where we should expect to find Vesuvius there are recorded a *mons sacer* and a *rivus tailo* which are unknown in that region. The *Hirrenses* are given the additional title of *Ittilenates*, and in the neighborhood we find a *flumen Bodua*, a river *Habita Maior*, a *mons Carvor Vettacensium*, the *fines Venetiatensium*, the locality *Machartana*, etc. Evidently the drawing does not refer to Campania, but to some country which it is impossible to locate. See A. Schulten, "Römische Flurkarten," *Hermes*, XXXIII (1898), pp. 557 ff.

[1] For the Ὀπικοί of Pseudo-Scylax see above, chap. i.

[2] See Beloch, *Campanien*, p. 410, who wrongly, as it seems to me, holds that the Iapygians arrived by sea. The account of Dionysius of Halicarnassus makes it certain that the Daunians arrived by land from the north, together with the Umbrians and other barbarians united with the Etruscans.

[3] Ὕρια is the name of a city in Boeotia; it was given to the island of Paros

with especial frequency in the regions occupied by the Iapygian race. We find a Hyria recorded by Herodotus on the Sallentine peninsula, and the same name occurs on the Messapian coast at Veretum, and in the center of that region at Orra or Uria. It is, above all, natural that the name should have been preserved in the neighborhood of Mount Garganus, which on account of its isolated position long preserved intact its original ethnical characteristics, and in that region the name of the Lago di Varano still records the existence of the adjacent Uria or Hyria, and of the people of the Hirini.[1]

It cannot be affirmed with absolute certainty that the Uria of Campania was a Daunian city, but there is some probability in favor of this hypothesis. Among the coins of Campania is a series bearing the legends Hyrietes, Hyrianos, and Urina. As everyone who has studied the history of ancient Campania knows, these coins have given rise to a great deal of discussion and to the formulation of numerous contradictory theories; but the most competent authorities seem agreed in attributing them to some city in the neighborhood of Nola, if not to the mint of Nola itself.[2]

and to a small island near Naxos. It is the name of a city in Cilicia (see the passages quoted in Pape-Benserer, *Eigennamen*, s. v. Οὐρία), and also of a lake in Aetolia (Strab. x, p. 459 C.). Moreover, the name Ὑρία has often (as, for example, by K. O. Müller) been brought into relation with that of the hero Orion, who was also localized at Messana, and with that of Zeus Urius. See the material given by O. Axt, *Die Gründungsage von Zancle* (Messina [Grimma], 1831), pp. 55 ff.

[1] The Ὠρίωνος ὄρος of Iapygia, mentioned by Pseudo-Scylax, 14 ff., as has often been noted, is the same as Mount Garganus, near which was located the Οὔρειον of Strabo (vi, p. 284 C.), or the Uria of Pliny (iii, 103; also termed *Irini*, *ibid.* 105), or Hyrium of Ptolemy (iii. 1. 14). Cf. Dion. Perieg., vs. 379; the coins with the legend YPIATINΩN in Head, *op. cit.*, p. 39; the Sinus Urias of Pomp. Mela ii. 66; and the modern name of Lago di Varano.

As was already noticed by Strabo, the Ὑρία of Herodot. vii. 170 corresponded to the Οὐρία situated between Brindisi and Tarentum (today Oria), or to Οὐρητόν (Strab. vi, p. 282 C.), the Veretum of the Romans (today S. Maria di Vereto). I think I have shown in my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, pp. 550 ff., that the Hyria of Herodotus is the same as Veretum, and that it is also to be connected with the Urites of Liv. xlii. 48. 7, to whom should be attributed the coins with the legend ORRA which are generally assigned to the Messapian Uria between Tarentum and Brindisi (cf. Head, *op. cit.*, p. 43). The forms Οὐρητόν and Ὑρία are also mixed in Ptolemy (iii. 1. 68), who uses the first form for the Mediterranean Uria.

[2] For the coins of the Campanian Hyria see the thoroughgoing observations of

For my own part, I am disposed to attach but little weight to the place where the coins were found, or to the resemblance of their types to those of Nola, since for Nola, and for Hyria or Uria, Phistelia and Alipha as well, there may easily have existed some common center for the derivation of such objects—a center determined by both political and commercial convenience, and by the influence of artists from Naples. A fact which seems to me of much greater importance is that the coins of Hyria, which, in the same manner as those of the other cities just mentioned and various other Campanian localities, show by the types on one side that Naples was the city whence they were derived, bear on the other side an allusion to the cult of Argive Juno.

So far as I know, this feature has been overlooked by numismatists, although it clearly indicates the existence of relations with the valley of the Silarus, or Sele, at the mouth of which was a well-known temple of Argive Juno, who figures also on the coins of Posidonia (Paestum). An examination of the coins makes it evident that the type was derived from the statue of the goddess which was worshiped at Argos.[1] The same type also occurs on the coins of Fenser, a city which was situated near Vesuvius, as is shown by the representation of Bellerophon and the Chimaera displayed on the reverse of its coins. I am disposed to admit, with Imhoof-Blumer, that the Latin name corresponding to Fenser is Veseris, or that of Vesuvius, although the battle of 340 B. C., in which the Latins were defeated, did not occur at the foot of Mount Vesuvius, as is held by Imhoof-Blumer and other scholars who

Imhoof-Blumer, "Zur Münzkunde Grossgriechenlands, Siciliens, Kretas, etc.," *Numismatische Zeitschrift*, Vienna, 1887, pp. 206 ff.; cf. Sambon, *Les monnaies antiques de l'Italie*, I, pp. 293 ff. From two coins in the museum of Berlin (Nos. 5, 6=Plate IV, 49, 49 *a*) Dressel, *Beschreibung der antiken Münzen*, III, 1, p. 98, derives "das Hyria und Nola eine gemeinsame Prägestätte hatten."

[1] For this temple see Strab. vi, p. 252 C.; Plin. *N. H.* iii. 71. For the type in Argos see Head, *op. cit.*, p. 367; at Posidonia (Paestum), Garrucci, Plate 121, Fig. 4. It also occurs on the coins of Himera, on the Punic coinage of Fiz (Palermo; cf. Holm, *Geschichte Siciliens*, III, Plate VI, Fig. 9; Plate VIII, Fig. 22), and among the types of Croton and Pandosia (Head, pp. 82, 90). In Campania it also appears on the coins of Fistelia (Sambon, I, Plate IV). For Elis see the *Catalogue of the British Museum*, "Peloponnesus," Plate XII, Figs. 11–18.

follow an erroneous account in Livy, but near the volcano of Rocca Monfina, above Suessa Aurunca, as I have elsewhere shown. The name "Veseris" seems to have indicated a burning mountain, just as possibly did that of Aesernia, a city which rendered especial honors to Vulcan.[1]

By clever numismatical observations Imhoof-Blumer has shown that the coins of Fenser must have been struck somewhere in the neighborhood of Urina, a city which on other numismatical evidence he considers to have been located not far from Nola. Following Millingen, he thinks that Fenser occupied the site of the modern village of Pernosano, between Nola and Lauro. It seems to me, however, that this locality is too far from Vesuvius. For my own part I would locate Fenser on the slopes of that mountain, somewhere in the neighborhood of Pompeii. It is certain that Pompeii was conquered by the Etruscans, and, thanks to the diligence of Mau, traces of Etruscan colonization have been discovered in that city, which I hold to be more recent than the Greek temple dating from the end of the sixth or the beginning of the fifth century, and of which remains are still clearly visible.[2]

Hyria or Urina I would locate not far from Fenser, in the valley of the Sarno, in the territory of Nucera; and although we have not enough evidence to show that it certainly belonged to the Daunians, we have at least sufficient data to prove that is was situated in the region which longer than any other portion of Campania preserved traces of the invading peoples before the Sabine conquest, and especially of the Umbrians who were united with the Daunians and Etruscans in the expedition of 524 B. C.

Strabo, in speaking of Acerrae, says that its name recalls that of the Acerrae near Cremona.[3] It is not certain whether we should hold, with Beloch, that the Acerraeans were of Etruscan origin,[4] or whether they should be considered a portion of the *συχνοὶ*

[1] Imhoof-Blumer, *op. cit.*, pp. 217 ff. Cf. the observations on Veseris in my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, p. 259.

[2] See Plate V in this volume for a column from this temple. Cf. also Mau, in *Röm. Mitth.*, XVII (1902), pp. 305 ff.; XIX (1904), pp. 124 ff.; XX (1905), pp. 193 ff.

[3] Strab. v, p. 247 C.

[4] Beloch, *Campanien*, p. 382.

PLATE V

Etruscan Column at Pompeii

τῶν ἄλλων βαρβάρων who came with the Etruscans about 524 B. C. It has hitherto escaped observation that Acerrae was also the ancient name of a city of the Umbrians, which had already been destroyed, at the time of Pliny and it is a noteworthy fact that it belonged to the people known by the name of Sarranates—a name which very closely resembles that of the Sarrasti of the valley of the Sarno.[1] That this coincidence was by no means fortuitous is shown by the statement of Strabo to the effect that the Acerraeans, instead of employing the neighboring port of Naples for the loading and unloading of their produce, preferred to journey twice the distance to the port of Pompeii *παρὰ τῷ Σάρνῳ*, which they used in common with the inhabitants of Nola and Nucera.[2] As has also been brought out by Nissen, this fact alludes clearly to political relations which existed before the Roman era,[3] and although it is not necessary to come to the same conclusion as does Nissen, that the Acerraeans were one of the peoples which founded Pompeii, it is evident that between the inhabitants of Acerrae and those of the valley of the Sarno there existed at an early period ethnical and political relations which were strengthened by material interests.

The statements of ancient writers concerning the origin of the inhabitants of Nuceria and of the peoples of the valley of the Sarno lead to the same conclusions. According to Conon, as quoted by the commentator on Vergil who is known by the name of Servius, the Pelasgians founded Nuceria and many other towns, and were the earliest of the so-called Sarrastes who inhabited the valley of the Sarno.[4] As we have already stated, Nuceria was a purely Umbrian name; but, on the other hand, it is not possible to harmonize these statements with the passage in Strabo which affirms that Pompeii and the fortress of Herculaneum were occupied, first by the Oscans, then by the Etruscans and Pelasgians, and lastly by the Samnites. In the well-known passage in which Strabo

[1] Plin. *N. H.* iii. 114: "in hoc situ interiere . . . . et Sarranates cum oppidis Acerris quae Vafriae cognominabantur."

[2] Strab. v, p. 247 C.

[3] Nissen, *Pomp. Studien*, p. 581.

[4] Con. apud Serv. ad *Aen.* vii. 738.

discusses the origin of Caere, and afterward that of the Etruscans, as a result of the theory that the Pelasgians emigrated from Thessaly to Tyrrhenia at a very early period, he mentions them together with the Etruscans.[1] This agrees perfectly with another statement, also found in Strabo, according to which the Umbrians were of Thessalian origin.[2] This theory was derived from fifth-century writers, such as Hellanicus, and was also repeated by the source of Trogus Pompeius.[3] From this it is evident that Strabo, in speaking of the occupation of Pompeii and Herculaneum by the Tyrrhenians and Pelasgians, alludes to the Etruscans and Umbrians who, together with the Daunians and other barbarians, invaded Campania about 524 B. C. It is possible that a trace of this invasion is preserved in the coins with types in imitation of the Neapolitan coinage, and bearing the legend IDN⊗F, of which examples have been found in various parts of Campania, and even in the Oscan tombs of Pompeii.[4]

From this it would seem that in the valley of the Sarno and near the territory of Nuceria there long remained traces of peoples which were less ancient than the Oscans, but which nevertheless preceded the Samnites in the conquest of Campania. The relation in which these early inhabitants stood to the Nucerians and their allies may be at least partially determined from an examination of the coinage of Nuceria and the neighboring cities. From the coins of Campania in general it is clear that certain cities, such as Hyria, Nola, Fenser, Phistelia, and Alipha, were especially prosperous. They had been influenced to a greater or less degree

[1] Strab. v, pp. 221 f.; cf. p. 225 C., where he speaks of Regis Villa and the Pelasgian Mallus, and x, p. 443 C., referring to Thessaly. In this last passage Strabo refers to Hieronymus of Cardia; in the passage treating of Caere he declares that he follows the generally accepted opinion (ὁμολογοῦντες πάντες σχεδόν τι). Also in his discussion of Pompeii and Herculaneum, Strabo naturally does not give his own opinions, but those of his sources.

[2] Strab. v, p. 213 C. [3] Hellan. apud Dion. Hal. i. 28; Iust. xx. 1. 1.

[4] Dressel, *Beschr. d. ant. Münzen*, III, 1, pp. 162 ff.; Sambon, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 337 ff. It may be noted, in passing, that the name "Phistelia" or "Fisteluis" (see Sambon, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 331 ff.) recalls not only the Samnite Phistlica near Saticula (Liv. ix. 21) but also the Umbrian name of the Plestini (Plin. *N. H.* iii. 114).

by the Greek element in Naples, and maintained commercial relations with that city. We are told that both Nola and the neighboring Abella were held to be Chalcidian colonies,[1] but the exclusively Greek legends on the coins of Nola, together with the pottery which has been found there, show that it had at least been greatly influenced and modified by the Greeks of Naples. Moreover, the good relations which existed between Nola and Naples are brought out by the story of the capture of Nola by the Romans.[2]

On the other hand, the fact that the coins of Uria and Fistelia bear legends which are at times Greek and at times Oscan, proves that in these cities the native element was more numerous and more capable of resistance. In the case of Alipha and of Fenser the same thing is true to an even greater degree. The coinage of Alipha, Hyria, Fistelia, and Fenser endured only about a hundred years (from the fifth to the fourth century), on a par with the Campanian coins with Greek legends. The time of its disappearance corresponds to the appearance of the coins of Nuceria in southern Campania, of those of Atella and Calatia in the central portion, and of Cales and Suessa Aurunca in the north. The coinage of the two last-mentioned cities was the result of Roman conquest; that of Calatia and Abella proves the spreading of the Sabine Campanian element; the coins of Nuceria Alfaterna indicate the strengthening of the Samnite confederation at the expense of the neighboring peoples. From the coins, and from passages in the ancient authors, we learn that to great ethnical and political changes often corresponded changes in the names of cities. The Tarentines gave the name of Heraclea to the city which took the place of Siris, and Dionysius II of Syracuse entitled Chalcidian Regium Phoebea. In Campania also the same phenomenon frequently occurred. As a result of the hellenizing influence the native Moera changed its name to Abella;[3] the conquest of Campania brought it about that the Etruscan Volturnum was called Capua; and as a result of the Roman conquest the

[1] Iust. xx. 1. 13; cf. Sil. Ital. xii. 161.

[2] Liv. viii. 23. 25 f.

[3] Serv. ad *Aen.* vii. 740.

name of Aurunca took the place of that of Suessa, and Dicaearchia was termed Puteoli.

It is also probable that southern Campania was affected in much the same way. The very name of Nola, the "New" presupposes an earlier city with another name. Noucria is termed a Tyrrhenian city by Philistus, and coined money with the inscription *Nuvkrinum Alafaternum*, which reminds one of the Oscan *Alfaterni* (the Albii, or "White"?), who also appear in Latium, in the region of the Hernici, and in the Sabine territory.[1] It is even possible that the Samnite gens of the *Alfaterni* may have seized the city of the Umbrians and of the Tyrrhenian Pelasgians of Noucria.[2] In the same way the gens of the *Pompeii* (or of the *Quinctili*) may possibly have gained possession of the region where the city arose, the Greek and Etruscan ruins of which bear witness to the fact that it had been colonized at various periods even before the time of the Samnites.

Future excavations may enable us to decide whether Pompeii arose on the site which had formerly been occupied by the Etruscan Fenser or by the obscure Irnthe, and whether the ruins of Varano, or of the Campanian Stabiae, still preserve traces of the still older Hyria or Uria of the Daunians.[3] The question of the Etruscan origin of Pompeii I shall defer till another occasion, but in the meantime, from the above observations on the Daunians and Umbrians, it is at least possible to conclude that the traces of these peoples endured more persistently in the valley of the Sarno than in the northern and central portions of Campania. Greek writers as early as the fourth century distinguished the region of this valley from the other territory of the Campanians, and attributed it rather to the Samnites dwelling adjacent to the Lucanians.[4]

The successive influence of the Greeks and of the Sabine Campanians absorbed the Etruscan element, of which, however,

[1] Plin. *N. H.* iii. 63. 108.

[2] For an analogous reason the *Nucerini* of Umbria are termed *Camellani*.

[3] Varano, as we have seen, is a modern name found near Mount Garganus, which corresponds to the ancient Hyrianus, near the ancient Hyria.

[4] Pseud.-Scyl., § 11; cf. Pseud.-Scymn., vss. 244 ff. Also in Liv. viii. 23 ff., the inhabitants of Nola are distinguished from the Samnites.

noteworthy traces remained in the Sabine alphabet, which is commonly termed Oscan. The Etruscan element, and also that introduced by the Daunians and Umbrians, became more and more faint, and after the fourth century, when Rome forced the Campanians to ally themselves with her and seized upon Greek Naples, it was probably no longer recognizable. That traces of the Daunians and Umbrians, who invaded Campania together with the Etruscans, remained longer evident in the southern portion of that region, and in the valley of the Sarno, is probably due to the fact that the frequent successions of peoples had less direct influence on southern Campania, and also to the fact that the importance of Magna Graecia, and of the indigenous peoples which succeeded the Greeks, was rapidly declining. And, this being so, we find an explanation for the fact that, notwithstanding the later Samnite occupation, Polybius could still speak of the Daunians as one of the principal peoples of Campania.

It may also be that the inferior development of this portion of Campania from the standpoint of civic organization bears some relation to the fact that, while in northern and central Campania, Polybius mentions the cities of Sinuessa, Cumae, Dicaearchia, Naples, and Capua, and the inhabitants of Cales and Teanum, when he discusses the southern portion he mentions only the inhabitants of Nuceria and Nola, and the Daunians. Even today, whoever traverses the two great sections of the Campanian plain which are separated by Mount Vesuvius cannot fail to notice the inferior civic and social development of the villages situated in the valley of the Sarno, as compared with the cities to the north of Vesuvius or near the sea. A closer examination, such as I have several times had occasion to make, will result in the conviction that in the valley of the Sarno there still exists a dense population which anthropologically seems to differ greatly from the surrounding peoples, and which in many ways reminds one either of the ancient indigenous tribes anterior to the later Sabine invasions, or of some people entirely different from the Campanians and Romans, of whose presence numerous traces still remain among the inhabitants of the other regions of Campania.

FIG. 9.—Coins of Hyria.

FIG. 10.—Coin of Fenser.

XVI

CONCERNING THE EARLY HISTORY OF ISCHIA

I

Ischia was the earliest Greek factory which was located on the shores facing Campania, and, if we follow tradition closely, was the earliest of the factories which the Greeks founded in all of Italy. This is shown by the fact that Cumae was held to be the earliest of the Greek colonies in Sicily and Italy,[1] and that the Euboeans, who founded it, are said, according to a tradition repeated by Livy,[2] to have halted first on Ischia and the small neighboring islands, whence only after the lapse of some time they dared to establish themselves on the mainland at Cumae.

This statement of Livy's deserves credence, both because it entirely corresponds to the character of the earliest Greek colonists, who, like the Phoenicians, first selected the promontories and small islands, where it was easier to resist unforeseen and hostile attacks of the natives;[3] and also because the accounts of Livy, even though at times erroneous, in the case of the history of Naples are generally worthy of attention, and seem either directly or indirectly to be derived from some fairly well-informed local writer.[4]

[1] Strab. v, p. 243 C.

[2] Liv. viii. 22. 5: "Cumani Chalcide Euboica originem trahunt. Classe, qua advecti ab domo fuerant, multum in ora maris eius, quod accolunt, potuere, primo in insulas Aenariam et Pithecusas egressi, deinde in continentem ausi sedes transferre." As has often been noted, Livy here seems to mention Ischia twice by the two names of Aenaria and Pithecusae, and to forget Prochyta, or Procida. Pomponius Mela (ii. 121), too, mentions Prochyta in addition to Aenaria and Pithecusae. One might be tempted to believe both Mela and Ovid wrong. Ovid (*Met.* xiv. 89 f.) makes the statement: "Inarinem Prochytenque legit sterilique locatas—colle Pithecusas." It is quite possible, however, as we shall see, that the poet distinguishes the island of Ischia from the city of Pithecusae.

[3] The same norms and precautions which Thucydides (vi. 2. 6) considers as characteristic of Phoenician factories have, of course, value in the case of the earliest Greek colonization, and of every other of the same nature.

[4] See my *Storia di Roma* I, 2, pp. 487 ff., for the great value of the statements in

In the present state of our knowledge we cannot be certain of the origin or the value of the report that Cumae was the oldest of the Greek colonies of Sicily and Italy, and was therefore earlier than those which arose on the Strait of Messina and the Ionian coast. Nor is it easy to determine why its foundation was attributed to a date anterior to 1000 B. C.—several centuries earlier than the historical and apparently reliable date assigned for the origin of the other Greek colonies in the West.[1] For our purpose it is enough to note as certain that Cumae was the earliest colony on the shores of the region inhabited by the Opici, just as Pithecusae or Ischia, which preceded it, was the first region to receive the Euboeans, who in later periods were to do so much toward civilizing the country which they inhabited.

A fresh examination of the problems involved in the history of Campania is far from useless, and will be undertaken by me from time to time; but, aside from this, owing to such noble, even though remote, origin as that mentioned above, the details pertaining to the history of Ischia are peculiarly attractive. This charm is further increased by the marvelous beauty of that classic region, and by the fact that there is no noteworthy event connected with the maritime history of southern Italy, with which the name of Ischia is not in some manner joined.

The ancients praised the virtues of the health-giving waters of Epomeus, but they seem to have suffered from its wrath much more frequently than have the modern inhabitants of the island.[2] It is perhaps due to this greater volcanic activity that the safe and welcome refuge of Alphonse of Aragon, Pontanus, Jovius, Vit-

Livy in regard to Naples. It is worthy of note that Velleius (i. 11) makes no mention of the halt of the Chalcidians at Pithecusae.

[1] See my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, pp. 158 ff., where these various problems are discussed.

[2] The ancients supposed that the giant Typhon, overcome by the thunderbolt of Jove, was lying under Epomeus. Strabo (v, p. 247 C.) recalls three eruptions: (1) that which drove out the Eretrians and Chalcidians; (2) that which occurred shortly after 474 B. C. and caused the Syracusans to leave the island; (3) that which took place shortly before the birth of Timaeus. A fourth eruption, in 91 B. C., is mentioned by Julius Obsequens, 54 (114). Timaeus (*loc. cit.*) says that the ancients narrated many wonderful things in regard to Ischia.

toria Colonna, and Maria of Aragon, although celebrated by Pindar and Vergil, did not in early times offer attractions to men who were famous in politics or in letters, or at least was not frequented by them to such a degree as were Baiae, Puteoli, and Capri.[1]

Even more than by the beauty of land and sky, and the excellence of the waters, the Chalcidians and Eretrians were probably attracted by the commercial opportunities which Ischia offered. And it is clear that even after the foundation of Cumae a Greek city must have flourished on the island. It is not equally easy to decide in what way the inhabitants of Pithecusae or Ischia attained noteworthy prosperity. According to Strabo, this was due to the fertility of the soil (*εὐκαρπία*) and to the gold mines (*τὰ χρυσεῖα*).[2] The statement concerning the fertility needs no comment. Even today, after such a lapse of time, Ischia may well boast of the extraordinary productive power of its soil. It is far different in regard to the gold mines. Although various writers on Ischian affairs, from the time of the Renaissance on, have discussed the existence of such mines in antiquity, they have been able to offer

[1] It is obvious, however, that even in antiquity Ischia must have attracted numerous visitors, if only for the salubrity of its waters. Among the inscriptions dedicated to the protecting deities of the springs are one of a freedwoman of Poppaea (*CIL*, X, 6787), and another of Lacco (*ibid.*, 6804) recalling a freedwoman of the Antonines who was related to the Julian gens. From this latter inscription (unless, like 6802 from the same place, it was imported from a some other locality) it would seem that the imperial family held possessions on the island. At a more recent period various Neapolitan princes, such as Alphonse the Magnificent, had interests there.

As has been noted by Fraccaroli (*Per la chronologia delle odi di Pindaro*, p. 57), the most famous of those who in antiquity seem to have made use of the waters of Ischia was Hiero of Syracuse, who in 474, in spite of illness, was present at the battle of Cumae. He was afflicted with gravel, and the waters of Pithecusae were especially famous for their power to cure this malady (cf. Strab. v, p. 248 C.; Plin. *N. H.* xxxi. 9). It is by no means improbable, as Fraccaroli conjectures, that on the occasion when Hiero built a fortress and established a garrison on the island (cf. Strab., *loc. cit.*) he may also have tested upon himself the power of the waters.

[2] Strab. v, p. 247 C.: *Πιθηκούσσας δ' Ἐρετριεῖς ᾤκισαν καὶ Χαλχιδεῖς, εὐτυχήσαντες [δὲ] δι' εὐκαρπίαν καὶ διὰ τὰ χρυσεῖα ἐξέλιπον τὴν νῆσον κατὰ στάσιν, ὕστερον δὲ καὶ ὑπὸ σεισμῶν ἐξελαθέντες καὶ ἀναφυσημάτων πυρὸς καὶ θαλλάσσης καὶ θερμῶν ὑδάτων.*

no other proof than the words of the Greek geographer.[1] Moreover, all of the less credulous writers, and those less blinded by love of their country, have been forced to recognize that no trace of such mines has been found in Ischia,[2] and I am assured by a young and able geologist, who has also made a careful study of the neighboring regions, and to whom I turned after I had been led by historical and literary reasons to judge the traditional data without value, that the geological formation excludes the possibility of finding gold there at any period.[3]

In considering the above-mentioned passage from Strabo, it seemed to me some years ago that there must be some error, and that the pretended gold mines must be due to a corruption of the

[1] A definite statement that such mines existed seems to be made by Iasolino, *Dei rimedi naturali che sono nell' isola di Pithecusa* (Naples, 1588), p. 25. He writes: "And there are gold mines, as is shown not only by Strabo, but also by modern testimony. Thus we have the authority of Giovanni Elisio, who in the book on the *Bagni di Terra di Lavoro* . . . . says that the island of Ischia produced abundantly and luxuriantly diverse fruits and excellent grain, much wine, sulphur, alum and gold, as has also been discovered and proved by the most noble and clever Venetiani." Cf. also p. 38: "There is also a gold mine at Campagnano, near the chapel of S. Sebastian. This I believe to be the one mentioned by Strabo, which was examined and tested during the last few years by the Venetiani, as we learn from Giovanni Elisio." In the book of Elisio, however (*Opusculum de balneis* [also republished by Scipione Mazzella, Naples, 1591], p. 38) there is no allusion to this.

[2] Chevalley de Rivaz (*Description des eaux minero-thermales et des étuves de l'île d'Ischia* [Naples, 1846], p. 13) writes: "In regard to the gold mines which according to Strabo fomerly existed on this island, there is no longer any trace of this precious metal to be found, although it may possibly have existed there once. The rich mines of Nagyac, situated in the crater of an extinct volcano, prove that the existence of a gold mine in a volcanic region is not impossible." Chevalley here certainly follows Breislak (*Topografia fisica della Campania* [Florence, 1798], p. 315), who, after confessing that at his time there were no traces of gold mines on Ischia, cites the mine of Nagyac, and, relying upon the statement of Strabo alone, concludes that "at the time of the Eretrians such a mine could have existed on Ischia, and was destroyed or buried by the subsequent eruptions." Beloch (*Campanien*, p. 207) limits himself to the observation that the mines mentioned by Strabo have long been exhausted, and that their location is unknown.

[3] I am indebted for this information to Dr. G. de Lorenzo, who together with C. Riva has written the article, "Il cratere di Vivara nelle isole Flegree," in the *Atti d. R. Accad.* (Naples, 1900). For the geological formation of Ischia see Fuchs, *L'isola d'Ischia* (Florence, 1872).

text. For example, it seemed to me, and still seems, improbable that they should not have been mentioned by other writers, such as Pliny, who have discussed the peculiarities of the island. Considering also that by the Euboeans and Campanians the island was called Aenaria, I came to the conclusion that Ischia derived this name from the commerce in copper. Since no copper is found on the island, however, the name must have been derived from a storehouse of the metal which formed an important article of commerce between the Etruscans and the Greek colonies, just as at the neighboring Puteoli the iron was deposited which had been brought from Elba. This led to the final conclusion that instead of χρυσεῖα we should read χαλχεῖα, and that we have the Latin equivalent of this word in Aenaria.[1]

The above hypothesis, however, had no real historical foundation, and there is no especial reason for supposing that the trade in Etruscan copper was carried on more on Ischia than at any other point of the Campanian coast. On the other hand, a more careful examination of the peculiarities of the island, made on the occasion of a recent visit to Ischia, has led to the formation of a hypothesis which I regard as better than the other, and which, being based on a fact which has, so far as I know, hitherto escaped observation in this connection, I am emboldened to submit to the judgment of students.

We do not know why Ischia was called Aenaria, nor by whom it was first brought into relation with the myth of Aeneas.[2] In the same way, the origin of the name "Pithecusae" is obscure. A Greek legend affirms that the island was originally inhabited by the malicious Cercopes, who were said to have been changed into monkeys or πίθηκοι. It is uncertain, however, whether this myth, which is quoted by the historian Xenagoras of the Alexandrine age, has any connection with a legend earlier than the one of Aeneas just mentioned.[3] Be that as it may, it will suffice to note that both of these explanations of the names "Aenaria" and

[1] See my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, p. 159, n. 1.

[2] As is well known, both this myth and this etymology are found even in Naevius, frr. 17 ff., Baehrens.

[3] Xenag., fr. 13, in Müller, *F. H. G.*, IV, p. 528; cf. the other references collected by Seeliger, s. v. "Kerkopen" in Roscher, II, p. 1170.

"Pithecusae" derive their origin from cults and myths which at a fairly early period were localized on these and the neighboring shores. The name of "Aenaria," like "Procida," "Caieta," and "Leucosia," was brought more or less into connection with the cycle of legends relating to Aeneas, whose myth as early as the sixth century had been connected with these shores by Stesichorus of Himera. The derivation of "Pithecusae" from the monkeys, on the other hand, seems to be connected with the deeds of Hercules, which in neighboring regions, such as Heracleion or Herculaneum, at Baiae, and on the near-by Via Heraclea, had been localized by the Chalcidians, who had brought the cult with them from their native land.[1] For our purpose it is worthy of note that still another derivation of "Pithecusae" was given. Pliny says that it was thus called, not "a simiarum multitudine, ut aliqui existimavere, sed a figlinis doliorum."[2] Although there is no reason for preferring the latter of these derivations to the former, it is difficult to understand how Pliny, who was the prefect of the fleet of Misenum, and who was fairly well acquainted with this and the neighboring regions, could have insisted so strongly on the derivation of the name "a figlinis doliorum," if there had not existed at Pithecusae a manufactory of *dolia*, or *πίθοι*, and of clay vessels in general.

Today Ischia has no reputation for the production of pottery, but even to our day it has furnished in abundance the best of material for such an industry. De Siano, a writer of the beginning of the nineteenth century says:

> In various places on the island is found a clayey earth in soft, tenacious, and glutinous masses, which some term plastic clay, especially in the territory of Casamicciola, where it is commonly called *creta*. The income furnished by this article of commerce amounts to 30,000 ducats a year. Some of it is employed on the spot for making vases and bricks, and some is transported to Naples for making the *vasellame del Ponte*. It is there mixed with other clayey earths. The wonder is that the enormous yearly consumption which has gone on for so many centuries . . . .[3]

[1] The myth of the Cercopes seems to have originated at Thermopylae; cf. Seeliger, *loc. cit.*

[2] Plin., *N. H.* iii. 82.

[3] F. De Siano, *Brevi e succinte notizie di storia naturale e civile dell' isola*

This last particular is confirmed by Capaccio, a Neapolitan writer of the seventeenth century, who affirms that the Neapolitans had long made use of Ischian clay for making bricks.[1] All of the writers on Ischian conditions, moreover, have alluded to the enormous quantity of clay which was annually exported from the beds near Casamicciola.

At the present day this condition of affairs is greatly changed. During a recent visit to Casamicciola I ascertained that very little clay is now being produced. The workmen assured me that up to 1883, the date of the last earthquake, there were in the neighborhood of Casamicciola between sixty and seventy manufacturies of clay objects, and that their produce was exported throughout the gulfs of Gaeta and Naples as far as Salerno. Today Gaeta and Sessa are the greatest producers, and have for a long time supplied the Neapolitan market.

If during the last few centuries the excellent and abundant clay of Ischia has been so freely used in the fabrication of vases and bricks for Naples, it would be wrong to conclude that Pliny erred when he alluded to the manufacture of *dolia* in Pithecusae.[2] Moreover, if we consider the important part played in ancient times by the production of clay objects for exportation, and that clay vases were imported and scattered in large quantities by the Greek colonists among the indigenous peoples of Italy, it is more than natural to believe that the commerce in clay on Ischia was even more important in ancient than in modern times. If this is correct, the passage in Strabo which speaks of the χρυσεῖα or gold mines, and which seems to me cor-

d'Ischia, pp. 22 ff.; cf. Breislak, *Topografia fisica della Campania*, p. 333, who alludes to the many tunnels in the hill of Casamicciola covered with such plastic clay. See Chevalley de Rivaz, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

D'Ascia (*Storia dell' isola d'Ischia* [Naples, 1868], p. 67) observes that the commerce in this clay, termed *bianchetto*, was at one time very important, but that when other deposits were found in Sicily "this variety lost in reputation, and its production was abandoned." A glance at the map which accompanies the work of Fuchs, already referred to, will show in what parts of the island such clay appears.

[1] Capaccio, *Il forestiero* (Naples, 1634), p. 940.

[2] The ancient *dolia* discovered at Casamicciola are mentioned by G. A. D'Aloisio, *L'infermo istruito* (Naples, 1757), p. 4.

rupt, would be susceptible of a correction deserving of consideration. Instead of *εὐτυχήσαντες δι' εὐκαρπίαν καὶ διὰ τὰ χρυσεῖα* it would seem better to read for the last word *χυτρεῖα*. The Chalcidians and Eretrians would thus have become rich on account of the fertility of the soil and the manufacture of *χυτραι*, or pots of clay. Certainly from a purely paleographical standpoint the substitution of XYTPEIA for the corrupt XPYCEIA[1] presents no difficulty. Just as among the Romans there were places for the fabrication of vases and bricks termed *Figulinae*, so among the Greeks there were localities and cities which for the same reasons were called *Χύτρον*, *Χύτροι* and *Χυτρόπολις*.[2]

If the above emendation is correct, and Strabo wished to say that the Chalcidians and Eretrians prospered on account of the fertility of the soil of Ischia, and on account of the manufacture of clay vessels (the "figlinae doliorum" mentioned by Pliny), the result is more important than appears at the first glance. Given the great importance of the trade in vases in antiquity, and keeping in mind the extended commerce carried on by the Chalcidians of Cumae, Ischia, and the neighboring regions with the natives of the Volscian, Latin, and Etruscan territory, it would be worth while to discover how much, if any, of the whitish ware known by the name of "Chalcidian," and frequently found in the excavations in the above-mentioned regions, could have come from Ischia. To settle such a question, and to establish whether Pithecusae was really a center for the production and exportation of such wares, methodical exploration is of course necessary. To be sure, the region of Ischia where clay abounds is that which has been the most transformed by earthquakes, volcanic upheavals, and the action of the mineral springs, but the traces of this branch of the commecrial activity of the ancient Chalcidians could hardly escape the keen glance of a trained archaeologist. Furthermore, as we shall see, there are other regions of the island which, if carefully examined, would doubtless furnish elements for comparison. If such an undertaking were successful, it would perhaps aid in find-

[1] Cf. Suid., s. v. *χυτρεῖον, ἐν ᾧ αἱ χύτραι*; Hesych., s. v. *χύτραι. τὰ χυτροπώλια.*

[2] See Pape-Benseler, *Griechische Eigennamen*, s. vv.

ing the key to more than one of the problems pertaining to the earliest commercial relations existing between the Greeks and the indigenous populations of the peninsula. It should not be forgotten that Pithecusae, which we are supposing also to have been famous for its ancient χυτρεῖα, was the earliest Greek factory on the shores facing Campania, and possibly, if ancient writers tell the truth, in all Italy.

II

With this problem is in part connected another of no less importance, concerning the time when the Syracusans occupied and abandoned the island, and also concerning the place they occupied and the time when the Neapolitans succeeded them. This second problem is connected with the topography and strategic importance of the island.

In ancient times—and, we may add, down to a period not very distant from our own—Ischia was an important strategic position. It was so well adapted for sheltering pirates and for favoring maritime commerce that those who inhabited the opposite shores of the peninsula naturally sought to secure its possession for themselves. Moreover, if we keep in mind the character of ancient navigation, which sought as far as possible to hug the shore, it is evident that the control of Ischia meant the ability to command the two channels of Procida, and to favor or to hinder, as the case might be, the passage of ships plying between the coast of Etruria and Latium on the one hand, and Naples and the shores of Magna Graecia on the other.

That Cumae and her colony Parthenope, which soon became her rival,[1] should have wished to obtain control of the neighboring island, or at least to establish friendly relations with it, requires no demonstration. It is sufficient to note that, if the Pithecusians participated with the Cumaeans in the founding of Naples,[2] this shows that the relations which existed in the fifth century between the Cumaean Rhodians of Parthenope and the island of Ischia

[1] Cf. Lutat., fr. 2, Peter.

[2] Strab. v, p. 246 C.: Χαλχιδεῖς ἐπῴκησαν (i. e., Naples) καὶ Πιθηκουσσαίων τίνες καὶ Ἀθηναίων.

were of a friendly nature. On Ischia too, as on other occasions, some of the Greeks who fled from the invading Samnites when, in 438 and 421, they seized Capua and Cumae,[1] must have found refuge.

Ischia, together with the small islands of Procida and the rock of Vivara, formed a barrier which prevented the Tyrrhenian pirates from approaching unobserved the shores of Campania and Magna Graecia.[2] At least it served as an outpost, made it easier to attack hostile ships, and rendered it impossible for the Etruscans and the Volscians of Antium to present themselves unexpectedly off the coast of the Gulfs of Dicaearchia (Puteoli) and of Naples. Considering the strategic importance of Ischia, we understand how Hiero of Syracuse, when in 474 B. C. he hastened to Cumae to give battle to the Tyrrhenian fleet, should have made them pay dearly for his non-disinterested intervention, by seizing the island and founding a fortress there.

Strabo, who mentions this fact, adds that, on account of the volcanic activity and the earthquakes, the soldiers sent by Hiero abandoned the island and the fortress which they had just completed, and that immediately afterward the Neapolitans occupied both the fortress and the island.

Where was this fortress located, and at what time did the Neapolitans seize the island after the departure of the Syracusans? Such questions are difficult to answer, and so far as I know, have been badly propounded, and often incorrectly solved, by the various writers on the subject of Ischia, who have not carefully examined the passage in Strabo, and have been led to erroneous inferences by an inscription which has now disappeared, but which was long visible, cut on a mass of rock on Monte di Vico, above Lacco Ameno. The inscription, which has often been published, reads as follows: *Πάκιος Νυμψίου, Μάιος Παχύλλου ἄρξαντες ἀνέθηκαν τὸ τοιχίον καὶ οἱ στρατιῶται.*[3] In this inscription, which even

[1] Liv. iv. 37. 1, 44. 12; cf. Diod. xii. 31. 76.

[2] One is reminded of the fortress of Scylla built by Anaxilaus of Regium, the contemporary of Hiero, to check the Etruscan pirates (Strab. vi, p. 257 C.).

[3] Kaibel, *I.G.S.I.*, 894. I was unable to find this monument on the occasion

in the names of the leaders seems to reveal the Neapolitan domination of the island, several writers have seen a confirmation of the statement of Strabo, and think that it refers to the arrival of the Neapolitan garrison and its substitution for that of Syracuse.[1]

To this should be objected that the meaning of the passage in Strabo is by no means evident, and that it offers material for much doubt. From a chronological standpoint the words *οἱ πεμφθέντες παρὰ Ἱέρωνος τοῦ τυράννου τῶν Συρακουσίων ἐξέλιπον τὸ κατασκευασθὲν ὑφ' ἑαυτῶν τεῖχος καὶ τὴν νήσον. ἐπελθόντες δὲ Νεαπολῖται κατέσχον* are not clear. The city of Naples, to judge by literary evidence, did not arise before 446, when Thurii was founded. This results from a fragment of Timaeus[2] which alludes to the participation of the Athenians in the Neapolitan festivals in honor of Parthenope. The presence of Athenians in Naples is also recalled by Strabo, and is attested by the types of several Neapolitan coins, which imitate those of Thurii.

In opposition to the above chronological result it should be noted that the earliest Neapolitan coins are not those with the type of the Athena of Thurii, as is held by the best numismatists. The first coins of Naples recall those of Terina and are connected in substance with those of Syracuse between 470 and 446 B. C.[3]

of a recent visit to Monte di Vico, and learned that it had been thrown down from the mountain into the *tonnaro* below (cf. Beloch, *Campanien*, p. 208), although it deserved preservation more than any other of the national monuments of Ischia. Several of the older inhabitants recall the existence of the inscription, and connect its contents with the very fact of the overthrowing of the mass of rock upon which it was inscribed. The monument has already given occasion for the formation of a local legend.

[1] Strab. v, p. 247 C. Fuchs (*op. cit.*, pp. 46 f.), like many others, reproduces this erroneous opinion of the local writers.

[2] Tim., fr. 99, M. For the origin of Naples see my "La missione civile e politica di Napoli nell' antichità," in the Neapolitan periodical *Flegrea*, February, 1900.

[3] I am indebted for this important observation, which overthrows the chronology of Head (*Hist. num.*, p. 32), to the courtesy of Sig. Gabrici, director of the coin department of the Neapolitan museum. See Garrucci (*Mon. d. Ital. ant.*, 84, 18) for the similar coins of Naples and Terina, and cf. Head, *op. cit.*, p. 96. For those of Syracuse see Holm (*Geschichte Siciliens*, III, Plates I, II); cf. also the bull's head on the coins of Gela from about the middle of the fifth century.

It will not do, however, to lay too much stress on the archaic letters of the

Thus Naples, instead of about 446 B. C., seems to have arisen some decades earlier, and the Attic element does not seem to have penetrated there until some time later.

But even the numismatical evidence does not support us as well as might be desired. Even the earliest Neapolitan coins may easily be attributed to a period as late as 450 B. C. On the other hand, the fragment of Timaeus which makes explicit mention of the intervention of the Athenians at the time of the first or second expedition against Syracuse, does not exclude the possibility that some decades earlier than 427 or 415 B. C. Athens may have participated in the foundation of Naples, as Strabo seems to imply. The coins lead us to suspect, what would be most important if true, that the Attic-Thurian element of 446–427 was preceded by another, purely indigenous, derived from Cumae and Pithecusae; or, in other words, Chalcidian. Even this conclusion, however, is not entirely certain, since with the words *τινες Ἀθηναίων* the sources of Strabo indicate that even at first the Attic influence was rather weak. The imitation of the Thurian coins with the figure of Athena could have occurred some years later, after the relations with this metropolis of Attic origin had become closer and more important. To sum up, various indications lead us to believe that Naples arose between 480 and 446, but in the present state of our knowledge we cannot decide in what decade its foundation occurred, nor when the Attic element first entered.

In case Naples was not founded till about 446 B. C., it is impossible that the Neapolitans could have seized Ischia after 474, when the soldiers of Hiero left. Either Strabo confounded the Neapolitans with the Parthenopeans who inhabited the Rhodian Palaeopolis (the Pizzofalcone of the present day), or else his words *ἐπελθόντες δὲ Νεαπολῖται κατέσχον* should not be interpreted as referring to an immediate occupation on the part of the Neapolitans after the Syracusans had left.

On the other hand, it is hardly probable that Syracuse would

Neapolitan coins with the type of Terina, since similar letters appear on the coins of the Campanian Hyria from about 420 B. C. (cf. Head, *op. cit.*, p. 32) and on the oldest Campanian coins, which cannot date before 438 B. C.

have given up her interests in Ischia in the years following the death of Hiero (467) and the driving-out of the Deinomenids (466 B. C.). The maritime policy of the Syracusan republic was precisely similar to that of the Deinomenids and that which was later held by the two Dionysii. Considering that about 453 the Syracusans, more hostile than ever toward the Etruscans, seized Elba, and pushed as far as Corsica,[1] and that about 384 B. C. Dionysius pressed as far as the coast of Etruria and Corsica,[2] it is not probable that after 466, when Thrasybulus, the brother of Hiero, was driven out, and when the democratic government was established, Syracuse should have entirely abandoned her plan of guarding the Campanian coast, and of keeping on that account a foothold on Ischia.

The Greek inscription of Monte di Vico seems to indicate that the Neapolitans expected to construct a fortress there, and the Oscan names of the leaders cause us to think that this occurred, not about 480–440, when Naples arose as a purely Greek city, but rather several generations later, when the Samnite invaders had forced their way in, and formed a second element in the make-up of the population.[3] The inscription of Monte di Vico (possibly

[1] Diod. xi. 88 f.

[2] Diod. xv. 14; Strab. v, p. 225 C.

[3] This is shown by Strab. (v, p. 246 C.), who, after stating that Naples was founded by Chalcidians of Cumae, and some Pithecusians and Athenians, observes: *ὕστερον δὲ Καμπανῶν τινας ἐδέξαντο συνοίκους διχοστατήσαντες καὶ ἠναγκάσθησαν τοῖς ἐχθίστοις ὡς οἰκειοτάτοις χρήσασθαι, ἐπειδὴ τοὺς οἰκείους ἀλλοτρίους ἔσχον. μηνύει δὲ τὰ τῶν δημάρχων ὀνόματα, τὰ μὲν πρῶτα Ἑλληνικὰ ὄντα, τὰ δ' ὕστερα τοῖς Ἑλληνικοῖς ἀναμὶξ τὰ Καμπανικά.*

In 326 B. C. we see that at Naples the two *praetores* were called Nymphius and Charilaus, one a Greek and the other a Samnite name (Liv. viii. 25. 9), and that the two racial elements were represented in the government of the city. The inscription of Monte di Vico, however, offers two Campanian names only. Should we see in this an indication that the soldiers who built the fortress were mercenaries, or should we hold that the Graeco-Neapolitan element had lost interest in military affairs, and had turned them over to the Campanian Samnites? This latter hypothesis receives support from the fact that in 326 it was the Samnites and Nolans who assumed the task of defending Naples against the Romans. In the present state of our knowledge, however, it would be hazardous to venture any definite conclusions.

The question has also been raised as to whether Nymphius, father of Paquius, and one of the two Neapolitan generals of the inscription, may be identified with the

for paleographical reasons as well) does not seem to be earlier than 400 B. C., and may be of even later date.[1] There is no reason, therefore, for bringing it into relation with the passage in Strabo mentioned above, nor for deciding from it that the fortress of Hiero was situated there. Considerations of a strategical nature would lead us to locate the fortress elsewhere.

To be sure, Monte di Vico is a strategic position of some importance. From it one could survey the ships coming from Circeii, Tarracina, and Formiae, and its possession made it possible to protect the island from sudden attacks from the southwest. Such a position also secured the possession of the island on the side toward Casamicciola and Lacco, and on the side occupied by the fertile plain of Forio. But on the opposite side of the island, beside the channel of Procida, and facing the shore of Cumae, rises from the water the imposing rock upon which is still situated the castle of Ischia, of much greater strategic importance. Monte di Vico forms a natural bulwark for the village of Lacco Ameno and guards its inhabitants against sudden attacks from the north and the southwest. The castle of Ischia, on the other hand, served to survey the entire communication between the shores of Etruria, Latium, Magna Graecia, and Sicily. Monte di Vico was accessible by land and offered a strong position, which was naturally fortified by whoever was in possession of the island; but from the castle of Ischia, strong by nature and entirely isolated by the sea, it was possible to observe every ship coming from Sicily, Africa, the Gulf of Naples, Cumae, and Mount Circeius. It was the point which before all others must have attracted the attention of one, such as Hiero, who aimed to watch the movements both of his allies of Cumae and of the coast of Campania, and also those of

famous Neapolitan Nypsius, a general of Dionysius II (see Diod. xvi. 18–20). It would seem impossible to prove anything in this regard, since the name "Nypsius," which would seem to be the same as that of the Nymphius who was praetor in 326, appears on other inscriptions from Naples (e. g., Kaibel, No. 726) and also from Capua (*CIL*, X, 4251). Such a name may have been fairly common at Naples and in Campania.

[1] Beloch, in *Campanien*, p. 206, referred the inscription to the fourth century, and later in the *Ergänzungen*, p. 447, to the third century.

the Etruscans. It is quite probable that the Syracusans of Hiero, after they had seized the island, may have obtained a foothold at Lacco, and afterward upon the Monte di Vico above. The most elementary strategical considerations, however, lead one to conclude that the castle where Hiero placed his garrison could have been no other than the Castle of Ischia in which, some nineteen centuries later, Alphonse of Aragon was to place his 300 faithful Catalans. The history of Ischia, whether at the time of the Vespers which again brought it into relation with Sicily, or in the following period, records the struggles for this castle, but is silent concerning Monte di Vico, which occupied a much inferior position from a military point of view.

These statements are confirmed by several mediaeval documents which, so far as I know, have not as yet been made use of in this connection. In these are mentioned various localities of Ischia, and among them the *Castrum Gironis* as clearly distinguished from Monte di Vico. For unknown reasons certain writers have placed this *castrum* at Castiglione, between Ischia and Casamicciola, where there once existed ruins of which all trace has disappeared.[1] From the treaty of 1128 between Sergius, duke of Naples, and the people of Gaeta, it appears that the *Castrum Gironis* was distinct not only from Monte di Vico, but also from the island of Ischia itself.[2] Finally, that the *Castrum Gironis* was the same as the modern Castle of Ischia, we learn from the Renaissance writers, who place the city of Geronda beside the place which in 1301 or 1302 was desolated by a volcanic eruption, of which traces are still visible. Geronda occupied a place which

[1] Iasolino (*op. cit.*, p. 29) speaks of the ruins which in the sixteenth century still existed at Castiglione: "Under said castle, on the shore of the sea, gush forth the baths termed Castiglione, of wonderful power. [There one sees] extensive ruins of former buildings. We hold that this was an ancient city and possibly Hiero, the tyrant, who according to Strabo built the walls and inhabited . . . ."

[2] That the *Castrum Gironis* was a separate locality from Monte di Vico appears with all certainty from a document of 1036; see Capassus, *Monumenta ad ducatus Neapolitani historiam pertinentia*, II, n. 458, p. 283. In the treaty of Duke Sergius (Capassus *loc. cit.*, p. 159) reference is made to the inhabitants "in Insula maiore [i. e. Ischia] et Gerone et Procitha."

is even today called the *Arso* and *Cremate* (i. e., "burnt,"[1] near the village of Ischia, and was therefore near the Castle of Ischia and of Hiero.

III

From a complex of facts it would seem that the fortress of the Syracusans was the same as the Castle of Ischia, and that this was later occupied by the Neapolitans, who, like Hiero, were naturally interested in controlling the traffic through the channel of Procida.[2] From another group of facts, on the other hand, we would be led to believe that Pithecussae, the πόλις Ἑλληνίς of Scylax, must be sought, as has often been done, at Monte di Vico, or on the adjacent bay of Lacco. The inscription of Monte di Vico shows that about the fourth century the place was occupied by the Neapolitans. Moreover, the early remains found at Lacco, and the pottery, said to be of Greek workmanship, discovered in the necropolis of the Valle di S. Montano below Monte di Vico, would seem to show that a Greek city existed in that region.[3] This supposition is strengthened by the existence of a *tonnara*, or

[1] E. g., Elisius, *Opusculum de balneis* (reprint by Mazella [Naples, 1591], p. 38): "usque ad urbem Gerundam," which existed at the place "la Cremata." Of the name *Castrum Gironis* to indicate the Castle of Ischia a trace exists in the popular designation (which I found still to exist) of the place as the *Castello di Nerone*. It need cause no surprise that the name of "Castle of Hiero" was maintained throughout antiquity and in mediaeval times until after 1000 A. D.

The age of the above-quoted documents, and the character of the time when they were collected, exclude at any rate that the name of *Castrum Gironis* arose as a result of literary reminiscence. Such, on the other hand, was really the case in regard to the names *Valle de Negroponte* and *Casa Cumana* which from Renaissance times on were given to places near Casamicciola, and which were judged to be the seat of Chalcidians from the Black Sea, or from Euboea, and of the early Cumaeans; e. g., Iasolino, *op. cit.*, p. 30.

[2] The importance of Ischia, the Castle of Ischia, Procida, and Monte di Procida for the Neapolitans in their military operations against Gaeta appears from the above-mentioned treaty of Sergius. From this it is easy to infer that these localities were of analogous strategic importance to the ancient Neapolitans in their wars against the Campanians, Volscians, and Etruscans.

[3] For the remains at Lacco and Monte di Vico, and for the tombs of the Valle di S. Montano, see De Siano, *op. cit.*, pp. 73 ff., and Chevalley de Rivaz, *op. cit.*, p. 55, who affirms that the vases found there were of Greek manufacture.

place for catching tunny-fish, below Monte di Vico, and especially by the fact that at Lacco, S. Restituta is honored. She is the patroness of the whole island, and her cult is joined with that of the cathedral at Naples. From this may be inferred that after the fourth century and during the entire Roman period, Lacco was the chief town of the island, and that the reference in Pseudo-Scylax[1] is to Monte di Vico.

Such an identification is by no means certain, however, and it is quite possible that the Castle of Hiero or Castle of Ischia was still occupied in the fourth century. In addition to the above-mentioned mediaeval documents, this opinion may find confirmation in the verses of Ovid:

> Inarimen Prochytenque legit sterilique locatas
> Colle Pithecusas.[2]

The poet distinguishes Pithecussae from Inarime and from Ischia in the same way that in the agreement of Duke Sergius the *Castrum Gironis* (Castle of Ischia) is distinguished from the *Insula Maior*, or Ischia. That in Ovid we have not to deal with a mere error and case of duplication may perhaps be deduced from passages in Pomponius Mela[3] and Martianus Capella,[4] who likewise distinguish Pithecusa from Aenaria and from Ischia. Whatever may be said of these last-named authors, the double mention of Pithecusa and Inarime is clear when we remember that up to the time of Alphonse of Aragon the Castle of Ischia was entirely surrounded by the sea, and therefore constituted an island by itself, separate from the larger island. Possibly this duplication in the names of cities and islands explains why in Strabo, Livy, and Pliny the name of "Pithecusa" appears beside that of "Pithecussae."

In favor of the above interpretation of the words of Ovid, and

[1] Pseud.-Scyl. 10: Πιθήκουσσα νῆσος καὶ πόλις Ἑλληνίς.

[2] Ov., *Met.* xiv. 89 f.

[3] Pomp. Mel. ii. 121: "set Pithecusa, Leucothea, Aenaria."

[4] Mart. Capp. vi. 644: "Prochyta, Abaenaria Inarime a Graecis dicta, Pithecusa." See above for the passage in Liv. viii. 22: "primo in insulas Aenariam et Pithecusas egressi."

contrary to the opinion of those, such as Beloch and Kiepert, who place the city of Pithecussae at Monte di Vico, it may be noted that the words *sterilique locatas colle Pithecussas* apply much better to the rocky Castle of Ischia than to the fertile Monte di Vico. At any rate, we must abandon the hypothesis of Beloch, that all of Monte di Vico was occupied by the city of Pithecussae.[1] In that case Pithecussae would have been a city of considerable size, instead of the small village, proportionate to the size of the island, which one would expect to find. Today Ischia has about 25,000 inhabitants. If we keep in mind the lesser density of population in ancient times, as brought out by Beloch himself in his excellent work, it seems hardly probable, if not impossible, that a city could have existed on Monte di Vico with a perimeter surrounding the entire height. It is much more reasonable to suppose that there was a fortress on the hill perhaps, but that the population dwelt, not on the broad plateau of difficult access and exposed to the winds, but near the shore below, where the pleasing and sheltered village of Lacco is situated today. The isolated τοίχιον of the inscription, instead of being an extended and elaborate wall surrounding the height, as Beloch thinks, was more probably a small fortress or redoubt, similar to that of much more recent date which still stands above the *tonnara*, and near which once stood the block of stone on which the inscription was carved.

But even in case future archaeological exploration should prove the contrary theory to be true, and it be shown that at least from the fourth century on, the Pithecussa of Pseudo-Scylax occupied the present site of Lacco and Monte di Vico, it would by no means follow that that was the place occupied by the Eretrians and Chalcidians when they established the first factory on the island, nor that the chief town of Ischia during the seventh, sixth, and fifth centuries was located there. Lacco is important merely from its proximity to the sea, and its chief source of income is from fishing and from the neighboring *tonnara*. Monte di Vico could

[1] Beloch, *Campanien*, p. 208: "Dass die Höhe im Alterthum ummauert war, zeigt die oben angeführte Inschrift;" cf. Plan VII. If we accept the map of Beloch, the city would have covered an area not much larger than that of Forio, which today has a population of about 7,000, about one-third that of the island.

be of value for strategical reasons only. The main industries of the islands are centered elsewhere. To give an example of this, even to the present day the shore of Casamicciola is termed *Marina delle allumiere* on account of the alum produced in the region below Epomeus.[1] If it is true that the Chalcidians and the Eretrians of Euboea became rich through the fertility of the soil (δι' εὐκαρπίαν) and the gold mines (διὰ τὰ χρυσεῖα), or better the manufacturing of clay vessels (as we have suggested by proposing the correction of the χρυσεῖα of Strabo to χυτρεῖα), it is evident that the principal seat of these colonists must be sought, not at Lacco, but in the most fertile portion of the island, among the hills which extend from the harbor of Ischia to Casamicciola. There even today are extracted alum and clay, and there are the most productive of the hot springs. The severe volcanic upheavals which have from time to time modified the island to a great extent, and the convulsions which have more or less transformed the hilly region where Casamicciola is situated, have probably destroyed all traces of the earliest Euboeic factories.

Of the nature of such disturbances we have a slight indication in the traces which are still visible of the catastrophe of 1883. The convulsions recorded by Timaeus were probably of such colossal magnitude that those of modern times would seem relatively unimportant. Thus Pliny records a really remarkable earthquake which swallowed an entire city and left a lake in its place. This at once causes us to think of the circular lake near the shore of Ischia, which in modern times has been joined with the sea and is known as the *Porto d' Ischia.*[2] It is quite within the bounds of possibility that this sunken city should be identified with the earliest Chalcidian city of Pithecusa. It is also possible that it existed elsewhere, and not near Casamicciola.[3] The impossi-

[1] See de Siano, *op. cit.*, p. 22.

[2] Cf. Plin. *N. H.* ii. 203. This is also the opinion of Fuchs, *op. cit.*, p. 45.

[3] According to Timaeus (apud Strab. v, p. 248 C.), a little before his time (about 345 B. C.) Epomeus, or better, Epopeus, forced toward the sea all of the region between it and the water's edge (i. e., the hills of Casamicciola). This was reduced to cinders and spread over the sea for a distance of three stades, and then thrown back on the island. The noise was so terrifying that the inhabitants of the opposite

bility of deciding this question is due, among other things, to the fact that, according to the inscriptions, the famous mineral springs, for which the island was famous in antiquity, should be sought in the southern portion near Nitrioli. At the present time the springs are less numerous and conspicuous in that region, while they abound on the side toward Casamicciola, where the eruptions of hot water mentioned by the ancients certainly occurred. It is evident, however, that the numerous volcanic convulsions which have disturbed that region are sufficient to account for the absence of inscriptions, which must once have been found there in no less quantity than at Nitrioli.[1] Nevertheless, in spite of these convulsions, it may be that excavations undertaken by some learned and patient archaeologist will succeed in finding the remains of the earliest Greek habitations. If this is no longer possible, one should at least undertake the exploration of Monte di Vico, and still more,

coast fled into the interior. Cf. also the convulsions recorded by Pliny *N. H.* ii. 203. 4: "mox in his [i. e., at Pithecussae] montem Epopon, cum repente flamma ex eo emicuisset, campestri aequatum planitiae. in eadem et oppidum haustum profundo, alioque motu terrae stagnum emersisse et alio provolutis montibus insulam extitisse Prochytam." Compared with such convulsions, the current termed *Arso* or *Cremate*, which in 1302 laid waste for two months the region between the modern village of Ischia and Porto d' Ischia, would seem as nothing. Whether the region of Arso was inhabited in Greek and Roman times we have no means of establishing. It is not improbable, and even quite possible, that in antiquity, just as in modern times, a village existed at the foot of the Castle of Ischia.

[1] The inscriptions *CIL*, X, 6786, 6789, 6790, allude to Apollo and the Nitrodes. Possibly the same locality is referred to by other inscriptions, such as 6787, 6788, etc. Other inscriptions come from the southern region of the island, as 6793 (Citara), 6801 (Forio), 6802 (unless urban), 6803, 6804, 6805 (Lacco Ameno), in addition to the one from Monte di Vico (Kaibel, *IGSI*, 894). The only Greek inscription is not very ancient, and is attributed vaguely to the neighborhood of Casamicciola: Ἡλίῳ Μίθρᾳ ἀνικήτῳ (Kaibel, 891).

Although the waters of Nitrioli, as also those of Olmitello, have the reputation of aiding diseases of the bladder (see Chevalley de Rivaz, *op. cit.*, p. 165), the most efficient waters for such ailments, as likewise for gravel, are found to the north, at Ischia, Pantano, Gurgitello, Cappone, Acqua della Riva, etc. (See Chevalley de Rivaz, *op. cit.*, pp. 63, 70, 96, 112, 129.) It is worthy of note that the ancients, in speaking of the medicinal qualities of the waters of Ischia, allude merely to their efficacy in curing gravel (Strab. v, p. 248 C.; Plin. *N. H.* xxxi. 9). It seems natural to suppose that they meant the waters of the last-named localities rather than those of Nitrioli, even though Nitrioli alone is mentioned in the ancient inscriptions.

of the necropolis of the Valle di S. Montano below, where there are said to exist numerous fragments of pottery and traces of human habitations. Such researches would have the result of establishing the origin of the city situated above Lacco, of which even the name bears witness to Greek origin.[1] By investigations of this nature it may be possible to determine whether the designation of πόλις Ἑλληνίς given to the city of Pithecussa by Pseudo-Scylax belongs to Monte di Vico, and whether Ovid was alluding to this height or to the Castle of Ischia when he recorded the "sterilique locatas colle Pithecusas."

IV

Before leaving the subject of Ischia, let us consider briefly the relations which the island may have had with the shores of Africa. Pseudo-Scylax, in several passages which, so far as I know, have not as yet been brought into connection with our subject, in describing the coast and islands near Carthage mentions an island termed Pontia, and a city called Pithecusa which had a small island facing it. On the island was a city called Euboea.[2] This naturally brings to mind Euboean Pithecusa or Ischia and the Pontine Islands, and leads to the question whether the mention of these three names in connection with the African coast is merely casual or is due to ethnographic reasons, or to ancient commercial and maritime relations.

To prevent us from regarding as merely fortuitous the perfect resemblance between the three names, we may mention the fact that at Naples a quarter, or rather a block, of houses had a name (Megaris) recalling a quarter of Carthage, and that this same

[1] For example, Λάκκοι by the Sea of Marmora (Ptol. iv. 5. 20) and the Syracusan harbor termed Λάκκιος (Diod. xiv. 7) derived their names from λάκκος (="lake", "basin").

[2] Pseud.-Scyl. 111: ἔπεισε δὴ νησία ἐν τῇ Ἑρμαίᾳ ἄκρᾳ Ποντία νῆσος καὶ Κόσυρος . . . . Πιθήκουσαι καὶ λιμήν κατ' ἐναντίον αὐτῶν καὶ νῆσος καὶ πόλις ἐν τῇ νήσῳ Εὔβοια. Shortly afterward (112) is recorded a Ποντίων τόπος καὶ πόλις. We have not here to deal with the African cities conquered by Agathocles and termed Pithecussae, since Diodorus (xx. 58. 3) states expressly that this was the Greek version of the indigenous names, which had been given these cities because of the monkeys to which the inhabitants rendered divine honors.

name in a slightly different form (Megalia) appears also at Sinuessa.[1]

Our knowledge of the maritime and political relations existing between Carthage and the peoples of Magna Graecia and Campania is very fragmentary. This much is certain, however, that there was no bay or gulf of the Mediterranean which the Carthaginians had left unexplored, and from which, if necessary, they had not drawn mercenary forces for their military operations. To cite a single example, *Punicum*, near Caere, seems to preserve traces of an ancient landing-place of this people. That the Greeks acted somewhat similarly is natural. Campanian mercenaries were long in the service of Carthage, and numerous places on the African coast which were subject to Carthage testify by their Greek names to intercourse with Sicily and other Greek countries.[2] Toward the end of the Roman Republic a group of Campanians, and particularly some from Nocera and the neighboring Sorrentine peninsula, established themselves on the coast of Numidia, in the territory of Cirta, where in later times the names of the towns recalled the native land of their founders.[3] The reasons which led the inhabitants of the Sorrentine peninsula and the adjacent localities to turn toward the African coast were possibly the same as

[1] See my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, p. 476, n. 2.

[2] Cf. Herod. vii. 165; Diod. v. 17. 4; xiii. 80, for the Carthaginian mercenaries from Sardinia, Liguria, and the Baleares; Diod. xiii. 44. 62. 5, for the Campanian mercenaries. Cf. also the various localities of the African coast termed Νεάπολις and subject to Carthage, and also Clypea or Aspis. The *CIL*, VIII, p. 197, is probably wrong in denying the statement of Solinus (27. 8) that "Sicca Veneria" owed its origin to the Siculi who had there transplanted the cult of Venus Erycina.

[3] Cf. Mommsen, ad *CIL*, VIII, p. 618. Veneria Rusicade, Mileu Sarnensis and Minervia Chullu derive their names from Pompeii, from the Ἀθήναιον of Punta della Campanella, and from the river Sarno. The cause of these appellations was the Nuceran P. Sittius and his companions. It was by no means accidental, therefore, that at Veneria Rusicade was found an inscription recording the genius of the Colonia Augusta Puteolana (*CIL*, VIII, 7959), and we are not surprised that a "Napolitanus" (*sic!*) from Africa is called Blossius (*CIL*, II, 106), a purely Campanian name. These facts explain also the *tractus Campaniae* which figures in African inscriptions (*CIL*, VIII, 18909) or in those having reference to Africa (*CIL*, X, 6081).

those which led the inhabitants of Amalfi in mediaeval times to visit so many maritime regions, and which still lead the natives of neighboring Agerola to seek their fortune in far-distant lands across the sea. It was relations of this nature, finally, which gave life to the legend of S. Restituta, the patroness of Ischia. The story goes that her body was miraculously borne to Lacco Ameno from the shores of northern Africa.

That which took place at the end of the first century B. C. may also have occurred in Greek times, and it is quite possible that the industrious Chalcidians of Campania, who were just as addicted to commerce as the Carthaginians, should have frequented the African shores and visited certain landing-places there, much as did the Carthaginians along the coast of Italy.[1]

However, the scarcity, or rather the almost total lack, of material warns us not to indulge in bold and fruitless hypotheses, and we shall therefore refrain from investigating the subject from ethnographical and commercial points of view. For the moment it will suffice to have alluded to a problem which seems well worth formulating, even though, in the present state of our knowledge, a satisfactory solution does not seem possible.[2]

[1] A confirmation of the close relations between the African and Italian shores is found in the Punic-Etruscan treaty mentioned by Aristotle, to which may now be added the Etruscan inscription found at Carthage. Aside from the name "Pontia," which appears twice on the African coast, it is possible that the Etruscan Rusellae is connected with such interrelations. It has no parallel among Italic names, but reminds one of various African localities commencing with *Rus*= "head;" e. g., Rusguniae, Rusicade, Rusucurium, Ruspina.

[2] After long search, my friend, Professor E. Martini, head librarian of the National Library of Naples, has succeeded in finding for me a copy of the work of A. Giuochi, *Ischia dalla sua origine fino ai nostri giorni* (Rome, 1884, Armanni; quoted by Beloch, *Campanien Ergänzungen*, p. 468). It contains nothing new on our subject. It will suffice to note that, like preceding writers, Giuochi places (p. 7) the Syracusan colony of Hiero at Lacco and at Forio.

XVII

NAPLES AND ISCHIA AT THE TIME OF SULLA

According to the generally accepted opinion, when Naples came into the hands of the Romans in 326 B. C., she lost possession of the island of Ischia. To this fact are supposed to refer the words of Strabo,[1] who, after stating that the Neapolitans had occupied Ischia after the departure of Hiero, and that they also owned Capri, adds that at some period they lost Ischia in war and later received it again from Augustus in exchange for Capri. It seems to me, however, that this opinion, which even Mommsen, among others, accepts, is opposed by certain important arguments which, so far as I know, have hitherto escaped observation.

In the first place, if the Romans took Ischia from Naples in 326, it seems very strange that, founding a maritime colony in 313, she should have placed it on the island of Pontia, and should not, as did Hiero about 474, have occupied Ischia instead, which was infinitely superior from a strategic standpoint. If in 313 the Romans had really been masters of Ischia, a natural stronghold, easy to defend and possessing enough arable land to support a modest colony, they certainly would not have selected Pontia, which is smaller, less accessible, and strategically less important. Ischia, moreover, would have been a much more useful base for waging war against the Samnites who inhabited the region east of the gulf. In 310, for example, after the founding of Pontia, the Romans were worsted in a demonstration which they made along the shores of Nucera and Pompeii.[2] Moreover, it is seen from the texts that about 326 B. C. the Samnites of the Gulf of Naples were accustomed to lay waste the coast of Latium by maritime incursions, which could

[1] Strab. v, p. 248 C.; cf. Mommsen, *CIL*, X, p. 679. Beloch, in the supplement to the second edition of his *Campanien* (p. 447), abandons the opinion of Mommsen, as advanced on p. 205 of the first edition.

[2] Liv. ix. 38.

have been more easily guarded against and checked by the possession of Ischia.[1]

If, therefore, to guard against the invasions of the Samnites, of Agathocles, and of the Carthaginians,[2] the Romans planted a maritime colony of *Pontiae* and not of *Pithecusae*, the reason lies in the fact that Pithecusae or Ischia had not yet become their property, but had remained in the possession of the Neapolitans. It is by admitting that in 326 Naples had not lost the fertile island which was of such importance for her own maritime commerce, that one fully understands the reference to the *foedus aequum* which Rome contracted with Naples,[3] a city which until 172 B. C. at least continued to be the naval center of the Romans, or, more exactly, the most important city of the allied naval forces on the Tyrrhenian coast.[4]

If, however, in 326 B. C. Naples was still in possession of Ischia, it remains to discover at what time she lost the island, and to what period we should refer the war recorded by Strabo, as a result of which Naples was deprived of what was one of the gems, and probably the most precious gem, of her small colonial dominion. It seems to me that the date may with sufficient probability be placed in 82 B. C., the time when the followers of Sulla were enabled through treachery to penetrate into Naples by night, and, after slaughtering the majority of the citizens and putting the rest to flight, to take possession of the war triremes.[5]

During the social and civil wars the various cities of Campania, and also those of other regions of Italy, saw the necessity of

[1] To deceive the Samnite leader who occupied Palaeopolis, Nymphius, one of the two praetors of Naples, asked that he "sineret se classe circumvehi ad Romanum agrum, non oram maris sed ipsi urbi propinqua loca depopulaturum" (Liv. viii. 26. 1); cf. Strab. v, p. 232 C., and my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, p. 409, n. 1.

[2] For the importance of the maritime colony of Pontia in regard to the relations of Rome with Carthage and with Agathocles, see below, pp. 290 f.

[3] See my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, p. 485.

[4] Polyb. i. 20. 14; Liv. xxxv. 16. 3; xxxvi. 42. 1; xlii. 20. 3; xlviii. 6. 9. For a discussion of the maritime power of Naples see below, chap. xix.

[5] App. *B. C.* i. 89: ἐς τε Νέαν πόλιν ἐκ προδοσίας νυκτὸς ἕτεροι τῶν Συλλείων ἐσελθόντες ἔκτειναν ἅπαντας χωρὶς ὀλίγων διαφυγόντων καὶ τὰς τριήρεις τῆς πόλεως ἔλαβον.

siding either with the Italians or with Rome, or else with Sulla, or with the leaders of the party of Marius. Sulla was just as liberal in rewarding the cities which opened their gates to him as he was severe in punishing his adversaries. For that reason it is clear that Naples could not have averted from herself the same evils which befell Stabiae and Nola in Campania, and elsewhere Norba and Praeneste. The territory of Nola was given to the soldiers of Sulla, Pompeii received a Sullan colony, the territory of Calatia was united to that of Capua, the colony of Urbana was created in the Falernian territory, and that of Stabiae was given to Nuceria Alfaterna, one of the cities friendly to Sulla. In like manner Naples paid for her hatred of the Sullan party with the dispersion and slaughter of her citizens, with the loss of her ships of war, and finally, as it seems to me, with the confiscation of the better portion of her territory.[1]

We are ignorant of the fortunes of Naples during the period between the invasion of Hannibal and the social wars, but from the fact that many of her citizens unwillingly accepted Roman citizenship,[2] and considering that in 82 B. C. the majority of them had been put to death, we naturally come to the conclusion that, as we should expect in a city given over to maritime commerce, the democratic party was the more powerful. This conclusion is strengthened by the fact that at Naples, which differed from other cities that preserved for a long period an aristocratic constitution, the highest political authority was concentrated, not in the hands of the archon, who still existed, though in a subordinate position, but

[1] For Pompeii, Nola, Capua, Nuceria, and Urbana, see the passages collected by Mommsen, *CIL*, X, pp. 89, 366, 142, 144, 460; for Stabiae see Mommsen, *ibid.*, p. 84; cf. Beloch, *Campanien*, p. 248. For Calatia or Caiatia, see *Lib. col*, s. v, p. 232, Lach; cf. Mommsen, *CIL*, X, p. 444.

In the inscription which Sulla is said to have had placed on his tomb was said: *ὡς οὔτε τῶν φίλων τις αὐτὸν εὖ ποιῶν οὔτι τῶν ἐχθρῶν κακῶς ὑπερβάλετο* (Plut. *Syll.* 38). By this Sulla wished one to have in mind the benefits or punishments with which he rewarded or afflicted, not so much his particular friends or enemies, as the cities or states which either favored or opposed him.

[2] Cic. *Pro Balbo* 8. 21: "in quo magna contentio Heracliensium et Neapolitanorum fuit, cum magna pars in eis civitatibus foederis sui libertatem anteferret."

rather in the δήμαρχος, a democratic magistrate corresponding to the tribune of the plebs.[1]

From the above it results that in 90 B. C. the Julian law which granted to Naples Roman citizenship in reality deprived her of the independence derived from the *foedus aequum*, although it did not reduce her to the level of one of the numerous *municipia civium Romanorum*. The very fact that Naples was able to preserve her war triremes for eight years longer, or until 82 B. C., shows that she was granted some favors. Even after the bloody devastation and repression of Sulla, Naples still preserved noteworthy traces of her former autonomy, and down to the Augustan age or even later made use of the Greek language in official documents.

With the sacking of Naples and the slaughter of her inhabitants seems to be connected the establishing of the villa of Lucullus, which occupied the entire hill of Pizzofalcone and the Castel dell' Uovo. It was easy for Lucullus, the intimate friend of Sulla, to appropriate for his magnificent villa the region where Rhodian Parthenope or Palaeopolis had been situated, since this was destroyed during the war of 82 B. C.[2] An analogous fate again befell the hill of Pizzofalcone in 902 A. D., when Ibrahim-ibn-Ahmed passed the Faro and threatened even the coast of Campania. Gregory, the consul of Naples, together with the bishop, Stephen, and others in power, decided to dismantle the Lucullan fortress, and for five days in September and October of that year the Neapolitans themselves leveled the houses of that pleasant region, and transferred its inhabitants within the walls of the city to the east.[3]

It is true, however, that the most splendid period in the history

[1] This explains the singular fact that at Naples Titus and Hadrian, instead of filling the office of archon, although this office endured, accepted that of demarch. See below, chap. xix.

[2] Concerning the existence of Parthenope or Palaeopolis at Pizzofalcone, I accept the view of Capasso, which seems to have been corroborated by new arguments and considerations. See my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, pp. 470 ff.

[3] Joh. Diac. *Acta transl.*, n. 9 S; Sever. in Capasso, *Monum.*, I, pp. 291 ff.; cf. Schipa, *Storia del ducato napolitano* (Naples, 1895), pp. 218 ff.

of the rich Roman villas which extended from Pizzofalcone to Posilipo and Pozzuoli, seems to coincide with the overthrow of Neapolitan autonomy. The decadence of Naples was closely connected with the increasing prosperity of Pozzuoli, just as the growth of Parthenope had been with the decay of Cumae.[1] Certainly Puteoli was the first to benefit by the destruction of the Neapolitan fleet in 82 B. C. Although about 172 B. C. Naples had been the most important of the Tyrrhenian maritime cities, after 82 B. C. the region which seemed best adapted for the Roman arsenal was the strip of coast between Puteoli and Misenum. This condition of affairs was suggested, or rather, necessitated, by the nature of the region; and even today, after so many centuries, the naval workshops which have been established near Pozzuoli will have the effect of rendering useless the Neapolitan arsenal.

Of the labors undertaken for transforming the lakes near Baiae, and for giving them gates and a deeper approach, there is no mention until after the peace of Misenum in 39 B. C., when the incursions and opposition of Sextus Pompeius, the master of Sicily, obliged the Romans to readopt the maritime policy which in 313 had led to the founding of Pontia. That between 82 and 39 there is no mention of Pozzuoli and of a Roman arsenal on the coast of Campania is easily explained by the fact that during that period Rome neglected more than ever all maritime precautions. It was for this reason that about 66 B. C. pirates were enabled with impunity to coast along and lay waste the shores of Campania and Latium as far as Ostia, and to take numerous prisoners at Gaeta and Misenum.[2]

From still another circumstance, though only indirectly, we learn that up to 82 the destruction of Naples was of advantage to Pozzuoli. It was at Pozzuoli that Sulla passed the last months of his life, after he had given up the dictatorship, and even a few days

[1] Lutat. apud Philarg. *In Verg. ecl.* iv. 564=fr. 2 P. For the relations between the history of Naples and that of Pozzuoli see my "La missione civile e politica di Napoli nell' antichità," in the Neapolitan periodical *Flegrea*, February, 1900.

[2] Cic. *De Imp. Gn. Pomp.* 12. 33.

before his death he succeeded in subduing a serious rebellion and in giving the city new laws. Pozzuoli was, however, among the cities preferred by Sulla, and possibly, like Brindisi, among those which he benefited. And that the city was really dear to him we know from the fact that his death was caused by his having taken the proper aedilian and financial administration of the colony too much to heart. We are told, in fact, that he vomited blood in a fit of rage brought on because Granius or Gavius, the supreme magistrate, had not kept his promise of restoring the money necessary for the reconstruction of the *Capitolium* of the city.[1] Thus Sulla was at the same time the enemy of Naples and the benefactor of her rival, Puteoli.[2]

Following the oligarchical reaction, the various cities of Campania which had been injured by Sulla again raised their heads. Capua, for example, despite the conservative party, in 63 B. C. received back the colony which had been planted in 83, and obtained the territory of the colony Urbana. To Naples, however, the death of the dread dictator did not bring the same advantages, or at least did not restore her to her former condition.[3] Before she could recover the fertile island of Ischia, it was necessary to await the munificence of Augustus, who exchanged it for the pleasant little island of Capri, which the Neapolitans still owned. At that time, however, the maritime career of Naples was at an end, and for her at least, neither Ischia nor Capri was of the slightest strategic importance.

Thanks to the triumph of the oligarchic party and to the wrath of Sulla, Naples suddenly fell from the important position which she had occupied since the Second Punic War. Up to about 172

[1] Plut. *Syll.* 37.

[2] Val. Max. viii. 3. 8. Possibly the two inscriptions from the neighborhood of Pozzuoli recording a *centuria Cornelia* have something to do with the reorganization of the colony by Sulla. See *CIL*, X, 1874; and cf. the inscription of L. Aurelius Pylades, *N. S.*, 1888, p. 237=Ihm, *Add. ad CIL*, X. 369.

[3] I refrain from discussing the internal condition of Naples at the time of Pompey and Sulla. From Cic. *Ad Attic.* vii. 2. 5; 4. 2; 13. 1; cf. *Pro Coelio* 23, we may conclude that the aristocratic party, having become powerful at Naples, favored the policy of Pompey and combated that of Caesar.

Naples had been the principal maritime and military arsenal of the Romans. With Sulla ended a glorious period in the life of Naples, and there commenced what has ever since been one of the two principal aspects of our civic greatness. Lucullus, the confidant of Sulla, for the purpose of creating a villa, took for himself alone the region of Pizzofalcone, which was perhaps the most healthful as well as the most beautiful on the gulf. Even today after so many centuries, we still find here a few dwellings belonging to the well-to-do, and the population in general seems much more scattered than is the case in the other quarters of the city. The example of Lucullus was soon followed by others, and the adjoining regions as far as Posilipo and Baiae were given up to the villas of the rich and powerful few. Thanks to Sulla, and to the policy of Caesar, which in this respect followed much the same course, Naples, whose fleet had assisted the Romans in their conquest of Sicily and subjugation of Carthage and the East, became merely a pleasant place of sojourn.[1]

Just as that which is good is rarely dissociated from evil, so evil brings with it to a greater or less degree something of good. In the case of Naples, the misfortunes which befell her at the time of Sulla obliged her more than ever to cultivate music and the arts, and even more than in the past, poets, artists, and philosophers flocked thither from every direction. The Neapolitan philosopher Staseas became the leader of the Peripatetics;[2] the Nycaean Parthenius was greatly admired for the passion displayed in his love-stories; and finally it was at Naples that Parthenius educated the greatest and most delicate of Latin poets:

> Illo Vergilium me tempore dulcis alebat
> Parthenope studiis florentem ignobilis oti.[3]

[1] Ovid. *Metam.* xv. 711.

[2] Cic. *De Orat.* i. 104; *De Fin.* v. 8; 75.

[3] Verg. *Georg.* iv. 563 f.

XVIII

THE TEMPLE OF THE SIRENS NEAR SORRENTO

The *Notizie degli Scavi* makes no mention of certain discoveries made on the Sorrentine peninsula about 1896, at the time when the new road leading to the harbor of Massa Lubrense was constructed. The following information was secured by me on the spot itself, on the slope of the ridge which from the west overlooks the portion of the village lying on the shore. There, just behind some ancient ruins in which are recognizable traces of a church, in the district termed Fontanella, and on the estate of Canon Luigi Rocco, a contractor by the name of Caselli brought to light various fragments of columns and statues, which were soon dispersed, some being taken to Sorrento, some to Rome, and possibly some elsewhere.[1]

The architectural fragments and pieces of statues which I saw at Sorrento, and some of which may still be seen at the Hotel Victoria, belong to the Roman period. It was also rumored that traces of *rosso antico* and columns of marble had been found, but this I was unable to verify.

From this it is clear that at the point in question, situated on the bay between Cape Corno and Cape Massa, the traces of an ancient temple had been discovered. Among the objects found I wish to direct special attention to a fragment of a head in the archaic style, which was accidentally discovered by me in the neighborhood during the course of my investigations for the purpose of locating the site of the temple of the Sirens.

From well-known passages in Pseudo-Aristotle, Strabo, and Stephen of Byzantium, who derived their information from Timaeus, we learn that the temple of the Sirens was greatly venerated by those dwelling in the vicinity, and that it contained

[1] For this topographical information thanks are due to Sig. Almerico Gargiulo, of Sorrento, who kindly accompanied me on my excursions, and to Sig. Fr. Sav. Astarita, of Massa Lubrense.

ancient offerings which had been presented by the inhabitants of the place.[1]

Every student of Neapolitan history knows how many opinions have been advanced concerning the site of this famous temple, from which, according to some, the name of Sorrento itself was derived. Among the best known of modern investigators of Sorrentine topography is Capasso, who placed the temple between Massa Lubrense and the present Sorrento. The more generally accepted opinion, however, is that of Beloch, who holds that this edifice should be sought near the *marina* of Massa, where today is located the church of Santa Maria della Lobbra, a name in which he rightly recognizes a derivation from the Latin *delubrum*.[2] The discovery of the head would seem to favor this theory.

FIG. 11.—Peninsula of Sorrento.

According to Beloch, the church of S. Maria della Lobbra, which is situated below the village of Massa Lubrense and above its *marina* or landing-place, is built over an ancient temple. I

[1] Strab. i, p. 22 C.; v, p. 247 C.: ἐκ δὲ τοῦ πρὸς Συρρεντὸν μέρους ἱερόν τι δείκνυται καὶ ἀναθήματα παλαιὰ τιμόντων τῶν πλησίον [τὸν] τόπον. Steph. Byz., s. v.: Σειρήνουσσαι καὶ νεὼς αὐτῶν ἵδρυται καὶ τιμῶνται καθ' ὑπερβολήν. That the statements in these two passages are derived from Timaeus is shown by Pseudo-Arist. *De mir. ausc.* 103: καὶ νεὼς αὐτῶν ἵδρυται, καὶ τιμῶνται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὑπὸ τῶν περιοίκων θύσιαις ἐπιμελῶς.

[2] Capasso, *Memorie storiche archeologiche della Penisola Sorrentina* (Naples, 1846); Beloch, *Campanien*, p. 276.

PLATE VI

Archaic Head from Temple of the Sirens

shall not here discuss this theory, but merely note that, according to the authorities of the church—or of the *delubrum*—it has occupied its present site since the sixteenth century only, while before that time it was situated in the region termed Fontanella, beside the ruins which produced the fragments described above.

It is my intention merely to present a few topographical data, and not to discuss the head in question from an artistic standpoint. I shall leave it to more competent students of ancient statuary to discover whether it is a work of the sixth or of the beginning of the fifth century B. C., or whether it is an ancient copy of a work of that period. Certain of my colleagues, whom I have questioned, have not been entirely agreed in this regard. For my own part I wish to note that, even in case the fragment is a copy of an ancient monument, aside from the fact that it is not made of Italian marble, it is worthy of consideration that it comes from a place which from other indications seems to have been the site of the famous temple of the Sirens, in which there existed the offerings (*ἀναθήματα*) which already seemed ancient (*παλαιά*) to a historian of the end of the fourth or the beginning of the third century.

The cult of the Sirens was naturally connected with the difficulties experienced in navigating the straits between Capri and the mainland—difficulties which are even referred to by Italian writers of the Middle Ages. As a result of this, the entire mountain above Sorrento on the side toward the sea, and the islands which were also called "of the Sirens," were held as sacred to these divinities. The modern name *li Galli* for the "Islands of the Sirens" causes one to think of the opinion held by the ancients that the Sirens had the form of birds.[1]

It is readily understood that those who feared shipwreck, or who had been rescued from such a fate, should have held in great honor those whom they believed to be the tutelary divinities of these dangerous places; and if we examine closely the configuration of Capo della Campanella and of the steep precipices near by, we

[1] For the *mons Sirenianus* see *Lib. col.* (ed. Lachmann), p. 237; for the opinion that the Sirens had the form of birds, see Schander apud Bulle in the *Sirena Helbigiana,* pp. 31 ff.

see that the first harbor which could offer any degree of security to the mariner was the little gulf between Cape Corno and Cape Massa.

From the writings of Serafino Montorio[1] concerning the cults of southern Italy we learn that at the festival of S. Maria della Lobbra, which was originally held, not at the actual church, but at the maritime region termed Fontanella near Cape Corno, rites were performed suggestive of those which the ancients must have accorded the Sirens. Moreover, the cult of S. Maria della Lobbra was very important in that region in the past, and the sailors who departed from the present landing-place of Massa Lubrense, on arriving at Cape Corno saluted the little church "with the firing of mortars and arquebusses," and were answered "by the sound of the bells of the church." In addition I was informed that traces of this cult are still preserved, and that here, just as elsewhere under similar circumstances, an annual religious festival is celebrated by the seashore, at the place where the Christian church is said to have formerly stood.

I do not wish to maintain that we have in this an absolute proof of the persistence of the pagan cult of the Sirens. But at any rate, if the fragment really belongs to the end of the sixth or the beginning of the fifth century, it forms an additional argument in favor of the presumption that the temple of the Sirens stood on the shore below the present village of Massa Lubrense, and justifies our belief that the problem regarding the location of the temple has been solved.[2]

[1] *Zodiaco di Maria* (1713), p. 199. The mutilated copy at my disposal does not give the place of publication.

[2] The marble fragment was presented by me to the National Museum of Naples, of which I had the honor of being in charge. It is now the first monument to the right as one enters the gallery devoted to works of the archaic and archaistic periods.

XIX

THE CULT OF ATHENA SICILIANA AND THE AΘHNAION OF PUNTA DELLA CAMPANELLA

In 1892 was published for the first time the following inscription from Naples:[1]

ΔΟΜΙΤΙΑ ΚΑΛΛΙCΤ (*sic*)
Η ΑΘΗΝΑC · ΙΗΡΗΑ (*sic*)
CΙΚΕΛΗC
ΥΠΟ CΥΝΚΛΗΤΟ (*sic*)
ΔΗΜΟCΙΑ · ΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΗ

The inscription is incised on the back of a still older funerary relief representing the customary scene of leave-taking, and having in addition the inscription ΠΑΚΚΙ ΗΡΑΛΛΕΩΝ, which, with its mixture of Greek and Samnite names, recalls the statement of Strabo regarding the Neapolitan *fasti* and the names of the demarchs.[2]

The most noteworthy characteristic of the more recent of the two inscriptions is the mention of the cult of Athena Siciliana, a cult nowhere else recorded. This peculiarity has already caused several critics to study the monument, and to seek the occasion and time when the cult reached Naples; and, echoing the observations of Beloch in his excellent work on the Campania, it has been stated that the cult of Athena was foreign to Naples, and an attempt has been made to connect it with the relations which existed between Naples and Sicily at the time of the two Dionysii of Syracuse.[3]

[1] *N. S.* (1892), p. 202. Count L. de la Ville, to whom the preservation of the monument is due, confirms its Neapolitan origin. I am informed by Professor G. De Blasiis that it was found in the excavations made for widening the Vicolo Cavalcatoio outside of the Porta Capuana, where other sepulchral stones had already been found.

[2] Strab. v, p. 246 C. Cf. the inscription in the *Arch. stor. Nap.*, I (1874), p. 567; and *CIL*, X, p. 970.

[3] See E. Gabrici, in the *Rendiconti d. R. Accad. di Arch. Lettere e Belle Arti* (Naples, 1896), pp. 31 ff.

It does not seem to me that this reasoning is based on a secure foundation. Beloch deserves credit for having noted the importance of the Neapolitan coins bearing the head of Athena, in better establishing the participation of the Athenians in the foundation of Naples;[1] but is far from the mark when he says that "they are rather imitations of the types of Athenian and Thurian coins than the expression of a special cult, of which not the slightest trace has elsewhere come down to us."[2] Ancient writers are unanimous in declaring that the cult of the nymph Parthenope existed at Naples, although it finds mention on no epigraphic monument. With this I do not wish to deny the general correspondence existing between the special cults which flourished in different cities, and the frequence of inscriptions recording them. Thus, for example, it is by no means accidental, as we shall later have occasion to note, that in the entire tenth volume of the *Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum* the cult of Minerva appears but twice, and in both instances in maritime cities.[3] In the case of Naples, it seems to me that proof of this cult, which has hitherto been thought lacking, in reality is furnished by those same coins bearing the head of Athena, which teach us that the cult was imported from Attica. To this result we are also led by an examination of the coins of Cumae, Nola, Capua, Allifae, etc., which bear the head of Athena with her helmet decorated with olive leaves. All of these coins show relations with Attic Naples, and indirectly with Athens.[4]

The fact that Naples soon ceased to record the cult of Athena on her coins and confined herself to representing other deities,[5] together with the lack of inscriptions making mention of this goddess, can

[1] Beloch, *Campanien*, p. 30.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 50.

[3] *CIL*, X, 6102 (Formiae) and 7120 (Syracuse). For Scylacium, which was originally an Attic colony and had the epithet of *Minervium*, see Vell. i. 15; cf. *CIL*, X, 103.

[4] In certain coins from Cumae, Allifae, and Nola (see Garrucci, *Le monete dell' Italia antica*, Plate 83, Fig. 28; Plate 88, Figs. 20, 22), in addition to the helmet of Athena crowned with olive of the Attic-Thurian type, one sees the Attic owl. Cf. Iust. xx. 1. 13: "iam Falisci Nolani, Abellani nonne Chalcidensium coloni sunt?"

[5] Head, *Hist. num.*, p. 33.

PLATE VII

Inscription Referring to Cult of Athena Siciliana

PLATE VIII

Funerary Relief (Front of Slab Shown in Plate VII)

at the most lead one to suspect that the cult of Athena did not attain primary importance in that city. This supposition is strengthened by the fact that Pallas Athena is missing in the list of the *dii patrii* which Statius makes for Naples. Ceres, Apollo, and the Dioscuri are the divinities recorded in this connection.[1] We must, however, be careful not to lay too much stress on this argument, in spite of its plausibility, for Statius makes no allusion to the cult of Dionysus Hebon, although, as Beloch has brought out, from the evidence of literature he was the θεὸς ἐπιφανέστατος of Naples.[2]

Whatever may be affirmed concerning the importance of the cult of Pallas Athena at Naples, it seems evident that the inscription recording the cult of Athena Siciliana has little or nothing to do with the coins representing the Attic Athena. The coins bear witness to the participation of the Athenians in the founding of Naples, as is attested by ancient writers.[3] The inscription makes mention of a separate and distinct cult which may once have been grouped with another which was analogous and earlier, just as at Rome the earliest Juno cult was joined with that of Juno Regina on the Aventine, and that of Apollo in the campus Flaminius succeeded the other on the Palatine. In like manner the cult of

[1] Stat. *Silv.* iv. 8. 45.

[2] See the references in Beloch, *Campanien*, p. 53. Beloch (*ibid.*, p. 70), making use of the above quoted passage in Strabo supposes, with every probability, that the three *decumani* of Naples were named after Apollo (Via Anticaglia), Demeter (Via del Nilo), and the Dioscuri (Via dei Tribunali). This, however, does not involve the exclusion of the cult of Athena. This cult was certainly present in Attic Thurii, and the streets (*cardini* and *decumani*) of that city were called Heraclaea, Aphrodisias, Olympia, Dionysias, Heroa, Thuria, and Thurina (Diod. xii. 10). It would seem that at both Naples and Thurii the Athenians wished to draw attention from their political preponderance by concealing to a certain degree its external symbols.

To this should be added that Statius, in the above-quoted passage from the *Silvae*, alludes to the *dii patrii* who are said to have come to Cumae and from Cumae to Naples: "quos . . . . litus ad Ausonium devexit Abantia Classis" (iv. 8. 45). Statius would therefore seem to allude to the older divinities who came with the first Greek colonists. The Attic colonization of Naples did not occur till about the middle of the fifth century B. C.

[3] Tim. apud *Schol. vet. Lycoph.* 732; Strab. v, p. 246 C.; cf. Beloch, *Griech. Geschichte*, I, p. 505.

Venus Murcia in the valley of the Circus came into being before the cult and temples of Venus Erycina at the Porta Collina and on the Capitoline.

It now remains to discover from what Sicilian city the cult of Athena Siciliana came to Naples. The critic who first published the inscription naturally thought of the relations which existed between Syracuse and Naples, from the time of the second Athenian expedition against the Syracusan metropolis to that of the two Dionysii,[1] and of the mercenaries sent by the Chalcidians of Campania.[2] He also lays stress on the presence in Naples of generals of Dionysius II, and alludes to the Neapolitan Nypsius, the leader of the mercenaries, who was in the service of that ruler.[3]

These observations are correct as far as they go, but they are not sufficiently comprehensive. The political expansion of Syracuse on Campanian soil dates from 47 B. C. at least, when Hiero, having conquered the Etruscans at Cumae, occupied the island of Ischia and left a garrison there.[4] Again, about 453 B. C., there is mention of a Syracusan fleet which laid waste the coast of Etruria and pressed as far as Elba and Corsica.[5] And if, as we are told, the Neapolitans seized the fortress of Ischia after it was abandoned by Syracuse, this must have occurred, if not about 466

[1] Gabrici, *loc. cit.*

[2] Diod. xiii. 44. 2.

[3] Gabrici evidently follows Beloch (*Campanien*, p. 32), who by a mere oversight attributes fragment 127 of Timaeus = Athen. vi, p. 250*a*, to the time of the elder Dionysius. In two passages (249 *f*, *e*; 250 *a*) Athenaeus states that he was referring to the second (*νεώτερος*) Dionysius. Moreover, it does not seem to me that we have sufficient data for affirming that this passage refers to an expedition against Naples in Campania. It may be that during the time when Dionysius was living at Locri and possessed only Ortygia, he alluded, with the words, *γράμματα ἡμῖν, ἔφη, ἄνδρες φίλοι ἐπέμφθη παρὰ τῶν ἡγεμόνων τῶν εἰς Νεάπολιν ἀποσταλέντων*, to one of the various operations by means of which his generals sought to gain the quarter termed Neapolis in Syracuse. There was, in fact, a period of anarchy in which each of the quarters of Syracuse, separated as they were the one from the other by regular walls, was in the hands of a separate leader. It is, however, more natural to think that he referred to the Campanian Naples, on account of the brave Neapolitan Nypsius who was leader of the body of mercenaries at the time of Dionysius (Diod. xvi. 18. 1; 19. 1). It is also natural to suspect that a considerable number of these mercenaries were Campanians.

[4] Strab. v, p. 248 C.

[5] Diod. xi. 88.

B. C., at the latest about 427 or 415; that it to say, at the time when Syracuse was attacked by Athens and was gathering in all her forces, and when the Neapolitans sent mercenaries to the Athenians, whom they regarded to a certain degree as fellow-countrymen.[1] From the fact that the elder Dionysius, in renewing the maritime undertakings of 453, pushed as far as the harbor of Caere and Corsica, it is probable that he continued the relations with Naples also.[2] Without doubt that city had likewise relations with Agathocles of Syracuse, who drew from Samnium many brave mercenaries.[3]

The influence of Syracuse on the shores of southern Italy, Latium, and Etruria, extended over a period of about two centuries, from 474 to 289 B. C., and as a result these regions continued to be called *Sicilia* and their inhabitants *Siculi*. This I have elsewhere[4] shown for the Etruscans, Volscians, and Latins, and wish here merely to note that, in addition to the coast of Bruttium, the term "Siculian" was applied to the maritime cities and islands of Campania, such as Sinuessa, Procida, Cumae, and Palinurus or Buxentum.[5]

It is natural to expect that as a result of this great maritime and

[1] The words of Strabo (v, p. 248 C.), *οἱ πεμφθέντες παρὰ Ἱέρωνος τοῦ τυράννου τῶν Συρακουσίων ἐξέλιπον τὸ κατασκευασθὲν ὑπ' ἑαυτῶν τεῖχος καὶ τὴν νῆσον. ἐπελθόντες δὲ Νεαπολῖται κατέσχον*, indicate that there existed some connection between the Neapolitan occupation and the departure of the Syracusans. However, about 474 B. C. Naples was possibly not yet in existence, in which case one must either think of an occupation on the part of Parthenope (Palaeopolis) about 474–466 B. C., or else conclude that the text of Strabo is erroneous. The maritime prosperity of Syracuse about 453 would favor the opinion that Naples seized Ischia about 415–412, at the time when Athens was everywhere seeking allies, and those hostile to Syracuse, even among the Etruscans. See Thuc. vi. 88, 103; vii. 53.

[2] Strab. v, p. 226 C.; and see below, p. 268.

[3] Diod. xx. 11; cf. below, p. 291.

[4] See below, chap. xx.; see also my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, pp. 5, 484, 618; and my *Storia di Roma*, I, 1, pp. 141 ff. For the Etruscans see, in addition, Lyd. *De magistr.*, praef.

[5] See Steph. Byz. Πυξοῦς, Προχύτη (cf. Κύμη), Σινόεσσα, termed *πόλεις* or *νῆσοι Σικελίας*. Cf. Hor. *Carm.* iii. 4. 28: "nec Sicula Palinurus unda,"* an expression which even the best commentators, such as Orelli and Kiessling, do not explain. Certainly the place was not termed Siculian from the Siculian Sea which extended from Sicily toward Greece and not Italy.

colonial expansion, there should have remained traces of cults in the cities visited by the Sicilian ships. In the case of Campania I have elsewhere shown that the myth of the Thespiades at Cumae, and the cult in which were guarded the teeth of the Erymanthian boar, are explained by the relations which existed between Campania and the Dorians of Syracuse.[1] There is a possibility, therefore, that the inscription referring to the presence of the cult of Athena Siciliana in Naples should be regarded as fresh evidence of the political influence of Syracuse on that city. It is also possible, on the other hand, that the inscription refers to a divinity honored in some neighboring region rather than in Naples itself. We have already seen that the absence of direct evidence regarding the cult of Athena in Naples has no decisive weight. Indirectly one might conclude from the coins that such a cult existed; but it was, at any rate, of the Attic-Thurian, and not of the Sicilian, Athena.

An argument in favor of the view that the cult may have existed in the neighborhood is offered by the fact that a temple of Athena is known to have stood on the Punta della Campanella, near Sorrento and opposite the island of Capri. This temple, on account of which the promontory was given the name of Ἀθήναιον, did not exist in very ancient times. It had to its south the Islands of the Sirens, and to the north the temple of these divinities near Sorrento; and certainly the cult of the Sirens was older than that of Athena. Moreover, we learn from ancient writers that the cult of Athena gradually grew in importance, at the expense of the earlier one of the Sirens, and that the very *promunturium Minervae*, or Ἀθήναιον, was at first apparently called Cape of the Sirens. It is impossible to say just when this substitution occurred, and at what time the cult of Athena became of greater importance than that of the Sirens, which, however, still continued to exist. At the time of Timaeus, at the end of the fourth and the beginning of the third century, the latter cult was still in flourishing condition.[2]

[1] See below, p. 292.

[2] The exact situation of the temple of Athena near the islands and temple of the Sirens is given by Strabo (i, p. 22 C.), who later (v, p. 247 C.) says of the Athe-

This very substitution, however, and the fact that the *mons Sirenianus* was in part removed from the cult of the Sirens and given over to that of Athena, cause one to suspect that this worship of Athena was not indigenous, but had been imported from abroad. The maritime character of the goddess Athena, as we shall see shortly, would lead one to believe that she was borrowed from some city situated on the sea, either because the Punta della Campanella was provided with signals useful to navigators, or because it was of some military value.[1]

The Athenaeum was situated at the beginning of the route leading to Sicily, and from this fact alone it is easy to see how it could have become the center of the cult of Sicilian Athena, as mentioned in the inscription in question. The hypothesis, however, receives still more definite support from a myth which is related in regard to Sorrento, and which has hitherto escaped the attention of those who have published the inscription.

The story runs that Liparus, the son of Auson, proceeded from Sorrento to the island which takes its name from him, and that later, when an old man, he returned to his early home, where after his death his tomb was greatly venerated. His six grandsons, children of his daughter Cyane and of Aeolus, are said to have become rulers over a large portion of the Sicilian and Italian coasts. Iocastus was master of the Italian peninsula as far as Regium; Pheraemon and Androcles, of the northern part of Sicily, from the strait to Lilybaeum; and Agathyrnus, of that portion of the same region in which the city bearing his name arose. Xuthus became ruler of the territory of the Leontini,

naeum: *ὅ τινες Σειρηνουσσῶν ἀκροτήριον καλούσιν.* The words of Pliny (*N. H.* iii. 62), "Surrentum cum promunturio Minervae, Sirenum quondam sede," are understood when compared with the passage in the *Liber coloniarum*, p. 236: "Surrentum oppidum. ager eius ex occupatione tenebatur a Grecis ob consecrationem Minervae. sed et mons Sirenianus limitibus pro parte Augustianis est adsignatus. ceterum in soluto remansit. iter populo debetur ubi Sirenae." Compare the words of Strabo (v, p. 247 C.) where he speaks of the *ἀναθήματα παλαιά*, with those of Pseud.-Arist. *De mir. ausc.* 103 (98) (Timaeus); and Steph. Byz., s. v. *Σειρήνουσσα*, where he says that *τιμῶνται καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὑπὸ τῶν περιοίκων θυσίαις ἐπιμελῶς.*

[1] See below, pp. 229 f.

and Astyochus remained at Lipari.[1] From this partition of territory are excluded the regions occupied by the Dorians of Syracuse, Camarina, Gela, and Agrigentum—or, in other words, the coast to the south and southwest of Chalcidian Leontini—and the myth refers merely to the northern coast of Sicily, and to that of Italy between Regium and Sorrento.

It is not my purpose to discuss here the multifarious information to be derived from this legend, and to show, for example, that the Ausonian population of the peninsula, Lipari, and Sicily sprang from a common stock, and that the intermediaries in the relations between Sicily and Campania were the Dorians of Lipari, who waylaid the ships of the Etruscans, and whom we find at the dawn of authentic Roman history in connection with the sending to Delphi of a golden cup after the capture of Veii (396 B. C.).[2] For our present purpose it is enough to note that the ships of the Liparaeans, which frequented the entire coast of southern Italy and Sicily, were accustomed to call at Sorrento in preference to the other points on the Gulf of Naples. With this fact should possibly be connected the statement that at a later period, at the time of Sextus Pompeius and Octavianus, the Liparaeans were transferred to the Gulf of Naples.[3]

The fact that Himera also was located in the region assigned by the legend to the sons of Aeolus and grandsons of the Sorrentine Liparus is worthy of consideration. Near Himera, probably in the neighborhood of Thermae, was a celebrated temple sacred to Athena, which, from the account in Diodorus, seems to have been the most important of all those in Sicily.[4] There are, however,

[1] Diod. v. 7. 8.

[2] See my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, pp. 119 ff.; for the cup see my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, p. 12.

[3] Dio Cass. xlviii. 48, for the year 38 B. C.

[4] Diod. v. 3. Ciaceri (*Contributo alla storia dei culti dell' antica Sicilia* [Pisa 1884], p. 17) holds that the principal seat of the Athena cult in Sicily was at Agrigentum. This is quite possible, since the cult could have come to Himera from Agrigentum, on which city Himera depended for a certain period. Nevertheless, the account of Diodorus leaves no doubt that the cult of Athena was of the same primary importance to Himera, or rather the region near the Athenaeum, as the cult of Aphrodite was to Eryx, and that of Diana to Syracuse.

no historical elements which would lead to the belief that the cult of Athena Siciliana in Campania came from the neighborhood of Himera. The information at our command seems rather to indicate that the Dorian Liparaeans sought to maintain the best of relations with the Dorians of Syracuse,[1] and that the Syracusans, who reverenced Athena as a maritime goddess in the most important and ancient portion of their city,[2] succeeded in securing for themselves the control of the Campanian shores.

Aside from the question of origin, since the coast, the islands, and the maritime cities of Campania and Lucania, from Sinuessa to Procida, and from Cumae to Palinurus and Buxentum, were called Sicilian, it remains the most probable hypothesis that the same term was applied to the Athenaeum opposite Capri, on account of its maritime and political relations with Sicily. Naturally the Liparaeans tried to gain possession of Sorrento, which offered a secure base of action for their maritime operations and their piracy. It is clear, however, that the Syracusans never ceased to occupy that region, or at least the neighboring Punta della Campanella. They had early seized Ischia, and by their possession of the extremity of the Sorrentine peninsula, which dominated the Gulf of Naples, they kept track of the movements of the Etruscan ships and exercised their control over the neighboring Chalcidian cities.[3]

Probably the same reasons which led the Syracusans to occupy these strategic positions influenced the Neapolitans in not allowing others to take their place. We have not sufficient data concerning the regions which were subservient to Naples in early

[1] The best proof of the friendship of the Liparaeans for Syracuse is given by the expedition of the Athenians against Lipari (Thuc. iii. 88).

[2] Polem. apud Athen. xi, p. 462 *c;* Cic. *Verr.* II. iv. 118.

[3] In my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc. (I, p. 532) I erroneously stated that the passages in Statius *Silv.* ii. 2. 2; iii. 2. 24, recording the *Tyrrhena Minerva* of the Punta della Campanella, prove Etruscan domination in Campania. In reality the poet alludes to the Etruscan name of Minerva. If Sorrento is termed πόλις Τυρρηνίας by Steph. Byz. (s. v.), this merely proves that, thanks to Etruscan influence in Campania, various cities of that region were called Etruscan by Syracusan historians of the fifth century (e. g., Philist., fr. 41 M.), in the same manner and for the same reasons that these same localities, as a consequence of the maritime control of Syracuse, were in large part termed πόλεις Σικελίας.

times to enable us to trace with certainty the extent of her sway. We know that Capua was pressing her on one side,[1] and that the confederation of the Samnite peoples, which had its center at Nocera, succeeded in pushing as far as Sorrento and gaining possession of that city.[2] Notwithstanding this, however, the region near the temple of the Sirens, and even the temple itself, remained in the hands of the Greeks, of whom, after Cumae had fallen into the hands of the Samnites about 421 B. C., Naples was the natural, and even the solitary, protector.[3]

The opposition of the Samnite states surrounding Naples prevented her from holding any large amount of territory in the Campanian plain. To make up for this, she naturally sought to increase her power by sea. About the year 466, or at the latest about 427–412 B. C., Naples occupied Ischia and used it as a base of operations against the Samnites. The island henceforth remained in her possession, not merely till 326, as is generally held, but till a much later period, about the time of Sulla.[4]

There seems to be no doubt that Capri had always formed part of the domain of Naples. It was still in her possession when Ischia was taken from her, and was not given up until it was handed over to Augustus, at a time when there was no longer any question of a Neapolitan state or policy.[5] One easily understands that, although fertile Ischia from an economic point of view was much superior to the rocky island of Capri, for strategical purposes—as was shown at a period not very remote from our own—Capri was no less important to Naples, and was never allowed to pass into the possession of an enemy. It is also clear that Naples was interested in owning the promontory of Athena. Having full posses-

[1] According to the version of Dionysius (xv. 5), which in this particular is more trustworthy, the war between Rome and Naples was caused by incursions made on Campanian soil. Livy (viii. 22. 5), who supposes the Romans to be already masters of Capua, in this case is less reliable, saying that the war was caused by the hostility "adversus Romanos agrum Campanum Falernumque incolentes."

[2] Strab. v, p. 247 C.: Συρρεντὸν τῶν Καμπανῶν. Cf. the correct observations of Beloch, *Campanien*, p. 240.

[3] *Liber col.*, p. 236 L.

[4] See above, Chapters XVI and XVII.

[5] Strab., *loc. cit.*; Suet. *Aug.* 92.

sion of Capri, the Punta della Campanella, and Ischia, if she could not prevent the approach of hostile ships (which was and still is impossible), it was at least possible for Naples to learn of the impending danger and to take the necessary precautions against those who would have threatened the safety of the state from that quarter. Moreover, with the possession of the Athenaeum it was easier to control the Nucerini, who in 310 B. C. were the enemies of Rome and Naples. The Nucerini would naturally seek to have free access to the channel between Capri and the Punta della Campanella, even though they could reach the Gulf of Salerno by other routes.[1]

Aside from this, other and no less important considerations impelled the Neapolitans not to neglect the Sorrentine peninsula; for in the temple of the Sirens was also honored the Parthenope whose sepulcher Naples showed with such pride. On account of this cult, the inhabitants of the neighboring regions assembled there; and it is hardly necessary to call attention to the fact that in antiquity such cults and such gatherings were of much more importance, both commercially and politically, than at a later period.[2]

The inscription of Domitia Calliste given at the beginning of this paper has been interpreted as meaning that this Domitia had been promoted from the rank of priestess of Athena Siciliana to that of public priestess of the city of Naples.[3] This interpretation, however, can hardly be correct. The words *Ἀθηνᾶς ἱήρεα (sic!) Σικελῆς ὑπὸ συνκλήτο(υ) δημοσία γενομένη*, in bad Greek, merely mean that, by a decree of the Senate, Domitia Calliste was nominated *sacerdos publica* of Athena Siciliana. This leads to the conclusion that priesthoods from the neighboring regions subject to Naples were received in that city, just as at Rome the Laurentes-Laviniates, Succiniani, and Cabenses were gradually

[1] That the Samnites belonging to the confederation of Nuceria, in addition to Sorrento possessed Capri for some length of time, may possibly be derived from Vergil (vii. 733), who alludes to the relations between that island and the "Sarrastis populos et quae rigat aequora Sarnus;" cf. Con. apud [Serv.], ad vs. 738.

[2] Pseud.-Arist. *De mir. ausc.* 103 (98); Strab. v, p. 247 C.; Steph. Byz., s. v. *Σειρηνοῦσσαι.*

[3] Gabrici, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

added to the priesthoods of the earliest city on the Palatine.[1] The cult of Athena Siciliana of the Punta della Campanella was possibly added to that of Attic Athena in the same way that in mediaeval times to the worship belonging to the cathedral of Naples was added that of S. Restituta, patroness of Ischia, the island which was the most valuable of the Neapolitan possessions. In this manner religion was employed to strengthen the territorial, and as it were the national, unity of Naples.

In short, a complex of circumstances leads us, although with some reserve, to formulate the hypothesis that the cult of Athena at the Punta della Campanella is to be identified with that of Athena Siciliana mentioned in the inscription of Domitia Calliste, and that this cult arose as a result of the commercial and political influence of the Syracusans, and of the Siceliots who were more or less directly subject to them. This influence was especially felt during the period between 474 and 289 B. C. The reference to Naples in the inscription seems to indicate that Naples reclaimed all of the maritime territory which the Siceliots had occupied, and that she accepted the foreign divinities which had been imported to those places, and even granted them citizenship.

The supposition that the cult of Athena Siciliana had its seat at the Athenaeum of the Punta della Campanella, on the channel traversed by all the ships plying between Naples and Sicily, reminds one of the analogous situation of the temple of Athena on the extremity of the Sallentine peninsula. This temple was the first object to meet the eyes of those coming from Greece to Italy, and was still seen by those going in the opposite direction when everything else had disappeared. Like that on the Punta della Campanella, it was connected with the myth of Ulysses.[2] We are

[1] The expression *ἱέρεια δημοσία γενομένη ὑπὸ συγκλήτου* is merely a version of the Roman formula: "sacerdos publica electa a splendissimo ordine." See, e. g., *CIL*, X, 819, 813, 816, 950, 998, 999; cf. 3920, 5414.

[2] See my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, p. 554. The fact that the temple of the Punta della Campanella was also considered *ἵδρυμα Ὀδύσσεως* (Strab. v, p. 247 C.) offers no ethnographical or chronological clue to the origin of the temple, since the entire coast of southern Italy and part of that of Sicily were connected with that hero. Cf. e. g., Leuca, Terina, Baiae, etc.

likewise reminded of the statements of Polemon of Ilium regarding the cult of Athena at Syracuse, to the effect that, when those who had set sail from Syracuse reached the point whence one beheld for the last time the shield placed above the temple of Athena on the height of Ortygia, they threw into the sea a cup filled with flowers, honey, and incense, showing that, just as at Cape Leuca, the Athena of Syracuse was a protecting divinity of navigation.[1] That the Athena of the Punta della Campanella was regarded in the same light is attested by Statius, who alludes to a custom analogous to that of the Syracusans.[2]

Finally, the maritime character of the cult at the Athenaeum and its strict political connection with Naples are shown by what Livy relates for the year 172 B. C. When the Columna Rostrata which had been placed on the Capitoline after the naval victory of Cape Hermaeum, won in 255 over the Carthaginians, was struck by lightning, it was thought necessary to placate the wrath of the divinity by performing expiatory rites on the Capitoline where the ill omened event had occurred, and also "in Campania ad Minervae promunturium."[3] To explain why this special temple was selected, it is not enough to refer to the fact that during the First Punic War the Neapolitans had aided Rome with their ships, since that was also the case with the inhabitants of Regium, Locri, and Velia.[4] The passage in Livy is understood only by recognizing the maritime character of the Athenaeum at the Punta della Campanella, and by remembering that the maritime power of Rome about 172 B. C. was still founded on the naval forces of Naples. That this theory is probable, or even certain, is shown by the statements in Livy referring to the following year. We learn from Livy that in 171 B. C. the Greek cities of southern Italy continued to furnish

[1] Polem. apud Athen. xi, p. 462 *b*. For the relation of Athena to Poseidon, see the passages quoted in Preller, *Griech. Mythol.*, II², p. 878; cf. Ciaceri, *op. cit.*, p. 18. It is not out of place to record that on Cape Sunium in Attica were found the statues of both of these divinities together. For Athena, goddess of tempests, see the material collected by Roscher, *Lex.*, I, pp. 675 f.

[2] Stat. *Silv.* iii. 2. 22: "prima salutavit Capreas et margine dextro . . . . sparsit Tyrrhenae Mareotica vina Minervae."

[3] Liv. xlii. 29. 3. [4] Polyb. i. 20. 14; cf. Liv. xxxv. 16. 3; xxxvi. 42. 1 f.

the Romans with the necessary ships, and that Naples was the starting-point for the Roman fleet and the most important arsenal which Rome had at her disposal.[1] It was not, indeed, till the time of Sulla that this arsenal was destroyed.[2] Moreover, that Minerva was the divinity which presided over the Roman fleets is confirmed by the account that it was in honor of Minerva and Mars that Scipio burned the ships which he had captured from the Carthaginians.[3]

The Athena of the Punta della Campanella was greatly honored as protectress of navigation even down to imperial times. This is shown by a statement in Seneca to the effect that when the ships bound from Sicily to Naples reached the channel between Capri and the promontory of Minerva, they were compelled to take in their sails. The only exception to this rule was made in favor of the ships from Alexandria.[4] It would be interesting to know whether in this exception we should see an allusion to the ancient maritime supremacy of Alexandria, or whether it was a result of the relations which had existed between Alexandria and the Campanian cities prior to the time when Campania became Roman territory.[5] It would also be worth while to investigate whether traces of such practices were preserved in the customs which at a later period existed near Naples. Be that as it may, it is certain that the cult of Athena gradually replaced, and caused to be forgotten, that of the Sirens—those strange mythological beings who by their singing enticed the passing sailors to their destruction,[6] and whose rocks were white with the bones of shipwrecked men.[7] In this manner the honored protectress of industry and commerce

[1] Liv. xlii. 48. 6, 9. [2] App. *Bel. civ.* i. 89. [3] App. *Pun.* 133.

[4] Sen. *Ep.* x. 1. 2 (77): "cum intravere Capreas et promuntorium ex quo: *alta procelloso speculatur vertice Pallas,* ceterae velo iubentur esse contentae: siparum Alexandrinarum insigne iudicium est."

[5] Excellent proof of the relations which existed between Alexandria and Campania before the second century is given by the episode of the Campanian Decius Magius (Liv. xxiii. 7 ff.).

[6] Stat. *Silv.* ii. 2. 116.

[7] Verg. *Aen.* v. 864 f.: "iamque adeo scopulos Sirenum advecta subibat . . . . difficilis quondam multorumque ossibus albos."

was for a while associated with, and later substituted for, the wicked divinities who delighted in human misfortune.

It seems natural to think that this change of cult took place slowly and as a result of elements coming in from without. While, on the one hand, philosophical speculation put an end to the adoration of fierce and monstrous divinities, on the other hand the progress in the art of navigation taught the ancients the method of avoiding, or at least of diminishing, the dangers of the charming but treacherous Strait of Capri.[1] It is of no avail to note that from the earliest times of Greek colonization there had flourished on the neighboring coasts the cult of Leucothea, the goddess who above all others favored navigation, and who was in a way the opposite of the Sirens. Leucothea was worshiped publicly at Velia, at Naples, and on one of the small islands near Capri;[2] but no trace of such worship exists for the Punta della Campanella, which was sacred to the Sirens.[3] The substitution of Pallas Athena, and not Leucothea, for the Sirens makes all the more plausible the theory that the cult of Athena, which is very rare in southern Italy, was of non-Neapolitan origin, and was carried to the extremity of the Sorrentine peninsula by the Siceliots, and that a trace of this cult still remains in the inscription of Domitia Calliste, the public priestess of Athena Siciliana.

In setting forth these conjectures with all reserve, I am far from thinking that the problem has been solved. I merely wish to

[1] Cicero (*De deor. nat.* iii. 63), after setting forth the views of Zeno and the other Stoics on the essence of divinity, says: "qui tantus error fuit, ut perniciosis etiam rebus non modo nomen deorum tribueretur sed etiam sacra constituerentur. Febris enim fanum in Palatio et *Orbonae ad* aedem Larum et aram Malae Fortunae Esquiliis consecratum videmus." Cf. *De leg.* ii. 28: "illud vitiosum Athenis quod . . . . fecerunt Contumeliae fanum et Impudentiae; virtutes enim, non vitia consecrare decet. araque vetusta in Palatio Febris et altera Esquiliis Malae Fortunae detestanda atque omne eiusmodi repudianda sunt." These doctrines originated with Plato (*Polit.* ii. 379), and are also connected with Xenophanes of the Eleatic school.

[2] Plin. *N. H.* iii. 83.

[3] For the cult of Leucothea at Velia see Xenoph. apud Aristot. *Rhet.* ii. 23, p. 1401 Bk. In regard to Naples see the inscription given by De Petra, *Monumenti dei Lincei*, VIII (1898), p. 228; cf. Correra in the *Studi* of Milani, I (1899).

incite others to new investigations, and above all to undertaking explorations on the extremity of the Sorrentine peninsula, where it is asserted that, owing to the devotion of those residing in the neighborhood, there existed ancient offerings (*παλαιὰ ἀναθήματα*) sacred to the Sirens. Furthermore, on the spot where the temple of Athena arose we should expect to find, if not architectural remains, at least traces of pottery, which would make possible a much more exact chronological comparison between the two sanctuaries and the two cults. It is quite within the bounds of possibility that on the site of the temple of the Sirens, and on the island of Ischia as well, there still lies concealed the evidence which would throw new light on the earliest commercial relations existing between Campania and Greece.[1]

[1] I allude merely to the traces of pottery, because the dense population which inhabited Sorrento in Roman (*Lib. col.* p. 236 L.) times and later, probably destroyed the more important remains.

For the Graeco-Oscan necropolis discovered in 1837 near the Punta della Campanella, see the authors cited by Beloch, *Campanien*, p. 278. For the traces of antiquity on Ischia, see above, Chapter XVI.

XX

SICELIOT ELEMENTS IN THE EARLIEST HISTORY OF ROME

I

In the introduction to his Roman history Dionysius of Halicarnassus asserts that the foremost among the Greeks who preceded him in chronicling the deeds of the Roman people were Hieronymus of Cardia and Timaeus. He then mentions as second to these a series of such writers as Antigonus, Polybius, and Silenus.[1] Dionysius, however, is not accurate in this, not only because immediately afterward, in connection with the origin of Rome, he goes on to give the opinion of the Syracusan Callias, the contemporary of Timaeus,[2] but especially because, in discussing the early history of the Siculi, he actually repeats the words of Antiochus of Syracuse, the historian of the end of the fifth century, who asserted that Siculus, the eponymous hero of the inhabitants of eastern Sicily, was a fugitive who had come from Rome.[3]

Why was he said to have come from Rome instead of from one of the numerous other cities of the Latins or Oscans? According to the tradition preserved by the Roman annalist, in 494 B. C. the consul Sp. Cassius contracted the *foedus aequum* with the Latins, and even with the Hernici. After the beginning of the fifth century Rome was at the head of Latium, and although, as we shall have occasion to repeat, the date assigned to the *foedus Cassianum* is

[1] Dion. Hal. i. 5. 6.

[2] Dion. Hal. i. 72.

[3] Antioch. Syr. apud Dion. Hal. i. 73: *ἐπεὶ δ' Ἴταλος κατεγήρα Μόργης ἐβασίλευσεν. ἐπὶ τούτου δὲ ἀνὴρ ἀφίκτο ἐκ Ῥώμης φυγάς* (cf. *ibid.* 12). Pliny (*N. H.* iii. 57) says: "Theophrastus qui primus externorum aliqua de Romanis diligentius scripsit, nam Theopompus, ante quem nemo mentionem habuit, urbem dumtaxat a Gallis captam dixit, Clitarchus ab eo proximus legationem tantum ad Alexandrum missam." That Pliny is in error here is explained by the fact that such writers as Antiochus were soon forgotten. Pliny cites among his authors (i. 4; v; vi; vii. 154, 207) another writer of the fifth century, Damastes of Sigeum, who also made mention of Rome; see Dion. Hal. i. 72.

uncertain, and even the personality of this consul shows a mingling of various fantastic elements, yet there is no reason for doubting that in the middle, or toward the end, of the fifth century, at the time of Antiochus, Rome was the most conspicuous city of Latium.[1] The statement that after the time of Sp. Cassius and Coriolanus (494–486 B. C.) the Roman plebs were fed with Sicilian grain is doubtful, or possibly altogether false. On the other hand, the two shipments of Sicilian grain which, according to the Roman annals, took place in 435 and 411, and which perhaps really occurred in 427 and 403–401 B. C., are probably historical.[2]

This friendly intercourse between Rome and Syracuse finds confirmation in the references which have come down to us concerning the relations between the Etruscans and Syracusans. The Etruscan enemies of Syracuse, and of the other Greeks of Italy and Sicily, were defeated at Cumae by Hiero when, in 474 B. C., he went to the aid of that city,[3] and about 414 B. C. they sent ships to aid the Athenians against Syracuse.[4] They were also the obstinate enemies of Rome. At the end of the sixth century Rome had undermined the Etruscan power, and in the fifth century she fought against Fidenae and Veii. Roman tradition, when shorn of the particulars added by later annalists, and of a pretended chronological ἀκρίβεια (which, as we shall see in the following, and as I hope to show still better by future investigations, is utterly valueless for this period), finds general confirmation both in the history of the Greeks of Italy and Sicily, and also in their legends, which show a knowledge of the political conditions of the fifth century.

Since from the fifth century on there existed friendly relations between Rome and Syracuse, it is natural to seek for the nature and importance of these relations. To be sure, the problem has often received partial treatment, especially since the keen eye of

[1] For the *foedus Cassianum* and Sp. Cassius, see Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch.*, II, pp. 153 ff. For the Sicilian grain and Coriolanus, see *ibid.*, p. 147.

[2] Liv. iv. 25. 4, 52. 6. The results of Holzapfel (*Röm. Chronologie*, pp. 156 ff.) seem to me to give the correct dates of these two events.

[3] E. g., Diod. xi. 51; Pind. *Pyth.* i. 72.

[4] Thuc. vi. 88, 103; vii. 53, 54, 57.

Mommsen noted the great influence which the Dorians of Syracuse exercised upon Roman civilization. Following his example, it has been attempted to determine what words of their language have penetrated into Latin. The resemblance between the words which indicated the systems of monetary weights and measures in Sicily and in Latium has furnished material for extended discussion.[1] Art students too have seen the importance of this problem, and Helbig has well shown that the great hostility of Athens toward Syracuse at the beginning of the fifth century was due to the commercial hegemony of Syracuse, which prevented rival cities from participating directly in the traffic in Greek vases and other wares with the shores of Campania, Latium, and Etruria.[2]

It seems to me, however, that this problem has not been investigated in all its aspects, and that it is worth while to seek out the influence of these commercial relations on the earliest chronicles of Rome, and to ascertain how much of this history was derived from the Sicilian Greeks. It is natural to suppose that Syracuse and Sicily, which furnished Rome with many words relating to measures, coins, navigation, private contracts (loans), administration of justice, games, etc., should have been the first to occupy themselves with her history. Antiochus, Timaeus, and Callias were Syracusans, Silenus of Calatia and Philinus of Agrigentum were Siceliots, and all had a hand in the writing of Roman history. To trace their influence on the formation of the earliest history of Rome is both interesting and profitable, since, for the same reasons that this history contains various elements taken directly from that of Greece,[3] it is natural to suppose that other elements were borrowed from the history of the Greeks of Sicily and Italy.

[1] See Mommsen, *Röm. Gesch.*, I[6], pp. 198 ff.; cf. p. 444; Weise, *Die griech. Wörter im Latein* (Leipzig, 1882), pp. 75 ff.; *idem* in *Rhein. Mus.*, XXXVIII (1883), pp. 556 ff. It is hardly necessary to recall, for example, the name of the Roman coin (the forty-eighth part of an as) called the *sicilicus*, the medimnus termed *sicilianus*, etc.

[2] Helbig, in the *Rendiconti dell' Accad. dei Lincei*, 1889, pp. 79 ff.

[3] Cf., for example, the two stratagems of Tarquinius in regard to Gabii (Liv. iv. 50 ff.; Dion. Hal. iv. 50 ff.). They were taken directly from the story of Zopyrus and Thrasybulus (see Herod. iii. 153 ff.; v. 92).

That this really is the case is shown by the fact, as we shall see more clearly farther on, that the earliest Roman historians admit that the Siculi were the most ancient inhabitants of Latium; and it is brought out even more definitely by the myths of Heracles and of Aeneas. How and when these two myths became localized on the banks of the Tiber, and whether they came from Sicily or from Campania, it is not easy to determine. It will suffice to recall that at the beginning of the sixth century Stesichorus of Himera sang of the arrival of Aeneas in Campania, and localized in Italy the myth of Heracles and the herds of Geryon. Indeed, the arrival of Heracles on the banks of the Tiber was anterior even to the legend of Romulus, and was the most ancient fact in the pseudo-history of Rome, just as it was the most ancient fact in the pseudo-history of nearly all the Italiot and Siceliot cities, to which Heracles was said to have come even before the Greek colonists.[1]

If we remember that the Greek peoples and Greek historians localized the myths of their mother-country in the various countries where they dwelt for longer or shorter periods, and that the Romans were later disposed to receive these myths and false historical origins as readily as they did the Greek culture, it is more than natural to believe that the early Siceliot historians after Antiochus should have localized Italiot and Siceliot events and legends in Latium, and that their example should have been followed by the Roman annalists.

In the following pages I propose to enumerate and to examine the elements in the earliest history of Rome which are derived from Sicily, while the following chapter will deal with the elements which for the same reasons were derived from Magna Graecia. The enumeration will be brief and probably incomplete; but if the general plan is correct, the missing details may easily be filled in at some later period, either by myself or by someone else.

On more than one occasion Dionysius indicates the cities

[1] For the arrival of Heracles in the various Italiot and Siceliot cities, see Diod. iv. 23; Dion. Hal. i. 44; *Etym. mag.*, s. v. Μέταβος; Sch. Theoc. i. 116. The legends which are connected with the Γηρυονίς of Stesichorus were already mentioned in connection with the various Siceliot cities by Hecataeus; see Steph. Byz., s. v. Σολοῦς.

which were said to have been occupied by the Siculi before the pretended arrival of the aborigines. These were Caenina and Antemnae,[1] Falerii and Fescennium,[2] Tibur,[3] and Rome itself.[4] In this Dionysius does not quote Antiochus, but deduces his statements from his own sources, or rather from his Roman source. Varro—the teacher, so to speak, of Dionysius—asserts that Rome was originally occupied by the Siculi, and says that he learned this from the early Roman annals.[5] In the fragments from the Roman annalists we find other references of this nature. Cassius Hemina, an annalist of the second century B. C., says that Aricia and Crustumerium were founded by the Siculi;[6] a like origin was attributed to Gabii, on the authority, even if indirect, of an early annalist;[7] according to Cato,[8] the Sicani are said to have occupied Tibur before the Greeks; and finally Fabius Pictor, the father of Roman annalists, asserts that the Volscians also were Siculi by origin.[9] Certainly not all of these accounts are derived from Antiochus, but are the development of his theory and statement that Siculus was an exile who came from Rome. Whether or not the names of Ciciliano near Tibur, and of other localities termed

[1] Dion. Hal. ii. 35. [2] Dion. Hal. i. 21. [3] Dion. Hal. i. 16.

[4] Dion. Hal. i. 9. 40; ii. 1; cf. i. 73. For the Siculi at Lanuvium, see Serv. ad *Aen.* i. 2.

[5] Varr. *D. L. L.* v. 101: "Lepus quod Siculi quidam Graeci dicunt λέποριν, a Roma quod orti Siculi, ut *annales veteres nostri* dicunt fortasse hinc illuc tulerunt et hic reliquerunt id nomen." Cf. Fest., s. v. *Sacrani*, p. 321 M.=468 Th. d. P.

[6] Cass. Hem. apud Sol. ii. 10=fr. 2 in Peter, *F. H. R.*, p. 68: "Ariciam ab Archiloco Siculo;" Serv. ad *Aen.* vii. 661=fr. 3: "Siculum quendam nomine uxoris suae Clytemestrae condidisse Clytemestrum, mox corrupto nomine Crustumerium dictum." Both Cassius Hemina and Varro make use of the expression *Siculus* to indicate the Siceliots also. This has been overlooked by certain critics who in studying the language of the Siculi have regarded as indigenous and Sicilian various words of purely Greek character. I shall discuss this elsewhere.

[7] Sol. ii. 10. [8] Cat. apud Sol. ii. 8=Peter, *F. H. R.*, fr. 56, p. 52.

[9] Fab. Pict., fr. 2 in Peter, *F. H. R.*, p. 8. Also according to Cato (Peter, *ibid.*, fr. 7, p. 44), the aborigines (the earliest inhabitants of Latium) are said to have occupied in early times the country of the Volscians. It is possibly not out of place to note that the names of the two Volscian cities Ecetrae (Liv. ii. 25) and Vescia (Liv. viii. 11. 5) recall the Sicilian Echetla (Diod. xx. 31. 5) and Vessa (Polyaen. v. 1. 4). For the Siculus who went to the country of the Rutuli, see Serv. ad *Aen.* i. 533; cf. Verg. *Aen.* xi. 312.

Siculian by the ancients, really allude to the existence of the Siculi in various parts of Latium and central Italy, it is evident that only by referring to Syracusan influence can we understand the theories advanced by Antiochus and Philistus, the latter of whom connected Siculus, son of Italus, with the Ligurians, while Antiochus said that after the death of Italus, at the time of his successor Morgcs, Siculus came from Rome. It is hardly necessary to note that neither the derivation of Aricia from the Siculian Archilochus, nor that of Crustumerium from Clytemnestra, wife of a Siculian, has anything to do with the real existence of indigenous Siculi. In this case Siculus, by an obvious literary elaboration, is equivalent to Siceliot.

We cannot now determine with accuracy what writer was the originator of the above-quoted statements. It may have been either Philistus or Timaeus. At any rate, it is certain that before they were received by the early Roman annalists they had been given by Siceliot historians, in the same way that, even before the Romans, Greek writers had narrated the Trojan origin of Rome and Romulus.[1]

All of these various statements came into being as a consequence of the active commercial relations existing between Rome and Syracuse at least from the end of the fifth century, and as a result there arose the following curious legend, which is preserved in the commentary on Vergil known under the name of Servius. The story goes that the Syracusans, after conquering the Athenians, made the prisoners dig a trench called Thybris ἀπὸ τῆς ὕβρεως, and that "later, when the Siculi [i. e., Syracusans] went to Italy, they inhabited the region which extends from the present site of Rome to the Rutuli and Ardea," and when they arrived there, "ad imaginem fossae Syracusanae," they gave the name of "Tybrim" to the river which had formerly been known as the Albula or Tiber.[2] As far as I know, such an etymology, which is

[1] For the reference of Callias to Romulus and Remus, and to Telegonus, the founder of Tusculum, all descendants of Trojan Rome, see Mommsen in *Hermes*, XVI (1881), pp. 5 ff. For the Trojan origin of Rome according to Timaeus, see Geffcken, *Timaios Geographie des Westens* (Berlin, 1892), pp. 39 ff.

[2] Serv. ad *Aen.* iii. 500; cf. viii. 330. The form Θύβρις to indicate the Tiber is used by Paus. viii. 43. 2, in telling the myth of the Arcadian Evander, and by

also given to the Syracusan Thymbris, is accepted by no Roman writer for the Tiber,[1] but it is nevertheless natural to expect it in connection with the river of a city which called the early prisons cut in the sides of the Capitoline cliff *lautumia*—a word which, as early writers have also noted, was derived from the λατομίαι, or prisons, of Syracuse. It is possible that Rome also got from Syracuse the name of *carcer*, which was given to the neighboring *Tullianum*.[2] The Siculi who came to the banks of the Tiber were of course the Siceliots, since the Romans gave the name of Siculi indiscriminately both to the original inhabitants and to the Greeks of Sicily. This sort of attribution arises from the same cause which led Dionysius to term Fescennium and Falerii Siculian, and others to call them Argive, although Falerii was of Chalcidian origin.[3]

Plut. *Paul. Ael.* 30. Plutarch, moreover, often uses the form Θύμβρις (e. g., *Rom.* 1; *Cam.* 18; cf. Dionys. Per., vss. 352 ff.), which corresponds exactly to the Syracusan Θύμβρις; cf. Theocr. i. 116.

[1] The Syracusan origin of this legend is indicated by the fact that for the Syracusan Thymbris, to the banks of which, just as to the Tiber, Heracles is said to have come with the cattle of Geryon, was derived the etymology ἀπὸ τῆς ὕβρεως; see Sch. Theocr. i, vs. 116.

[2] Varr. *D. L. L.* 151: "quod Syracusis, ubi delicti causa custodiuntur vocantur latomiae, inde Lautumia translatum, vel quod hic quoque in eo loco lapidicinae fuerunt." κάρκαρ also is a word used by Sophron. apud Phot. *Lex.*, p. 132. 2; cf. Hesych., s. v.

[3] For Argive Falerii, see Cat. apud Plin. *N. H.* iii. 51; Steph. Byz., s. v. Φάλισκος; for the Chalcidian designation see Iust. xx. 11; for Argive Fescennium see Sol. ii. 7; for Achaean Perusia see Iust. xx. 13. Moreover, the Argei, who belonged to the most ancient *sacra* of the Roman patriciate, were Argives or Peloponnesans, as was noted by Wilamowitz apud Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht*, III, p. 123, n. 6. Probably (see Mommsen, *ibid.*) they were prisoners taken in war. It may be that the pretended Argive founders of Fescennium and Falerii were called into being after the Sabines had accepted from the Samnites the belief that they were descended from the Laconians. But this belief, which the Tarentines had evolved for political purposes (see Strab. v, p. 250 C.), although it had already been noted by Cato (apud Serv. ad *Aen.* viii. 638), did not arise at Tarentum before the beginning of the fourth century, when the Samnite-Lucanian invasion succeeded that of the Peucetian Iapygians. Although the influence of the Tarentines is evident in Campania after the second half of the fourth century (see Liv. viii. 25. 7, 27. 1, 39. 1; Dion. Hal. xv. 5. 10; cf. the coins of Suessa of the fourth century, Head, *Hist. num.*, p. 35), it possibly did not extend to the Sabines proper before the beginning of the third century. On the other hand, Falerii and Fescennium were not Sabine. It seems permissible to suppose that the Argive Pelopon-

According to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, the Greek writers who before his time had busied themselves with the deeds of the Roman people, had treated this subject in rather brief compendia.[1] The mere reading of even the few fragments of Timaeus pertaining to the history of Rome which have come down to us does not, however, give this impression. He discusses minutely, for example, the Trojan cults of Lavinium, and also the coins attributed to Servius Tullius.[2] Dionysius' statement should be received with caution. As a writer he was diffuse, and it is natural that the narratives of his predecessors should appear to him more in the light of compendia. In comparison with his first eleven books, the first three of Livy are in reality but mere outlines, although to modern writers, partly on account of the falsity or uncertainty of their contents, they seem much too long drawn out. However, the statement of Antiochus that Siculus was an exile who came from Rome is not isolated, but is connected with a theory concerning the beginnings of Latium and of the adjacent country of the Rutuli and Volsci.

Mommsen has well brought out the value of the statements of Callias, the historian of Agathocles, concerning Romulus and Remus, brothers of the Telegonus who founded Tusculum, and grandchildren of the Trojan Roma.[3] For the moment I have

nesans were no other than the Achaean Arcadians, of whom considerable numbers came to Sicily and the Chalcidian cities, especially at the time of Hiero, after about 480 B. C. (cf. Diod. xi. 49, 67, 72; Roehl, *Inscr. Gr. Ant.*, 95; Paus. v. 27. 1). In this case the Argive founders of Fescennium and Falerii would offer much resemblance to the Siculi who, according to Dionysius, first occupied these cities. Also Tibur, which according to Dionysius (*loc. cit.*) was Siculian, according to Horace (*Carm.* ii. 6. 5) was Argive.

[1] Dion. Hal. i. 5: *κεφαλαιώδεις ἐπιτομαὶ πάνυ βραχεῖαι.*

[2] For Lavinium see Tim. apud Dion. Hal. i. 67=20 Müller; cf. Lycophr. 1226 ff.; Geffcken, *op. cit.*, p. 147. For the origin of the Romans and the Trojan horse, see Tim. apud Polyb. xii. 46=fr. 151. For the coinage of Servius Tullius, see Tim. apud Plin. *N. H.* xxxiii. 43: "Servius rex primus signavit aes. Antea rudi usos Romae Timaeus tradit. Signato est nota pecudum: unde et pecunia appellata." This last sentence is fully explained when we consider that already in the Πολιτεῖαι of Aristotle attention was called to these coins and their relative use among the various states; see for example, *Arist. Frag.*, ed. Rose, 21; frr. 476, 510, 580, 589, 590, 593; cf. Arist. *Pol.* 10.

[3] *Hermes*, XVI (1881), pp. 6 ff.

nothing to add to this, and confine myself to a mere mention of the fact that in the legendary history of Rome at the time of the kings there is another element which refers to Syracuse; i. e., that relating to the Corinthian Demaratus. It is not easy to decide whether this legend at first referred to Tarquinius and was not localized at Rome till later, or whether it was related in connection with Rome from the very beginning.[1] It will suffice to recall that it is often explained as a result of the commercial relations between Corinth and Rome, since Corinthian vases were common in Rome and Etruria, and since, as has been noted by Helbig, in the fifth century Corinthian Syracuse monopolized the importation of Greek vases into Italy. Tarquinius is said to have been the son of this Demaratus, and, according to the explicit statement of Cicero,[2] introduced the provisions concerning widows and orphans which were found in the constitution of Corinth. Still another indication of the influence of Sicily on Rome is found in the cognomen of *Siculus*, which was used by one of the oldest of the Roman families, the Cloelii, who boasted of Alban origin.[3]

I shall not dwell longer on allusions of this nature, but prefer to discuss a complex of facts pertaining to the first years of the Republic, which relate to Sp. Cassius, Coriolanus, the cult of Ceres, the Roman secessions, the tribunate of the plebs, and the agrarian laws. It seems to me that all of these betray clearly enough Siceliot, and especially Syracusan, origin.

Let us commence with the first *secessio plebis*. The plebs who retired to the *mons sacer* were reconciled with the patricians by Menenius Agrippa, who recounted to them the anecdote of the various members of the body conspiring against the stomach. I shall not pause to show the numerous contradictions and improbabilities which have been noted in this narration, as well as in others

[1] It should not be forgotten that, according to the Greek historians, Rome was an Etruscan city; see Dion. Hal. i. 29.

[2] Cic. *De leg.* ii. 36.

[3] For the Cloelii Siculi see Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch.*, I, p. 113. In the earliest documents—i. e., the statutes of the year 436 or 426 B. C.—the cognomen does not yet appear. See Plin. *N. H.* xxxiv. 23; cf. Cichorius, "De fastis consular. antiquiss.," in *Leipziger Studien*, 1886, p. 179.

of early Roman history.[1] For our purpose it will suffice to recall that, according to a tradition followed by Cicero, and known also to Plutarch and Livy, it was not Menenius Agrippa, but the dictator Valerius (which brings to mind the consul Valerius of the second secession), who related the fable and made peace between the patricians and the plebs.[2] It is also necessary to note that the legendary character of the first secession appears from the fact that, while according to the source of Livy it took place on the *mons sacer*, according to other annalists, such as Piso Frugi, it occurred on the Aventine, whither the plebs are said to have retired at the time of the second secession in 449 B. C. The uncertainty of the tradition appears from the fact that in certain authors the plebs in both the first and second secessions occupied successively, but in different order according to the different sources, the two hills above mentioned.[3]

[1] See my *Storia di Roma*, Vol. I.

[2] Cic. *Brut.* 14. 54; Val. Max. viii. 9; Plut. *Pomp.* 13; cf. Liv. viii. 18. 12; Oros. ii. 5. 5; cf. Münzer, *De gente Valeria* (Oppoliae, 1891), pp. 18 ff.

[3] Pis. Fr. apud Liv. ii. 32. 3; iii. 54. 8; Cic. *Pro Mur.* 7. 15; cf. Sall. *Iug.* 31. 17. The uncertainty of the tradition brought it about that the first secession was fixed upon both heights in two successive occupations (see Cic. *De rep.* ii. 33. 58; Sall. apud Aug. *D. C. D.* ii. 18; cf. Schwegler, *loc. cit.*). Also the second secession was fixed, first upon the Aventine, and then upon the *mons sacer* on the Via Nomentana (Liv. iii. 52. 3). In referring to the first secession Varro says (*D. L. L.* v. 81): "tribuni plebei quod ex tribunis militum primum tribuni plebei facti qui plebem defenderent in secessione Crustumerina." From this secession the tribe of the same name is said to have been called. See Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht*, III, pp. 167, 171. The territory of Crustumerium also figures in the account of the second secession (Liv. iii. 42; Dion. Hal. xi. 23, 25, 27). The fact that Cicero narrates these secessions differently has caused Volkmar (*De annalibus Romanis quaestiones* [Marburgi, 1890], pp. 14 ff.) to think that Cicero may have written his accounts at different periods, both before and after the pseudo-history of the decemvirate had become further falsified, and having in mind contemporaneous facts relating to the history of Julius Caesar. Without entering into the question as to whether or not the character of Appius Claudius contains elements taken from that of Caesar, I wish merely to note that the diverse opinions expressed by Cicero may be explained by the different sources which he used, and that the Menenius Agrippa of 493 is quite possibly identical with the Menenius Agrippa who was tribune of the plebs in 410 B. C., and who was no less known and dear to the plebs than the other (see Liv. iv. 53. 11). We have various examples of such duplication of a single individual. The plebeian Junius Brutus of the first secession

Eminent historians, Mommsen among others,[1] believe, in substance, in the historical reality of the first secession. It seems, however, that the by no means casual resemblance in the particulars of the two secessions throws much doubt upon the actual existence of at least the first, especially since, as Niese has pointed out,[2] the names of the tribunes of the plebs who are said to have been nominated for the first time in 493 resemble too closely those mentioned by Diodorus for 471 in connection with the second secession for one to think that they do not refer to the same persons. From all these considerations I deem fictitious not merely the fable of Menenius and Valerius, and the particulars of the first secession, but the very occurrence of a secession in 493 B. C.

I am confirmed in the above statement by the further fact that Herodotus narrates a somewhat similar circumstance in connection with the Siceliot Gela. A sedition having occurred in that city, says Herodotus, those of the citizens who were worsted betook themselves to Mactorium, a city situated above Gela, whence Telines, an ancestor of Gelo, the tyrant of Syracuse, led them back to their native town. He accomplished his purpose without assistants, merely by the employment of the *ἱρά* of the infernal deities. How Telines obtained possession of these *ἱρά* Herodotus does not tell us. He only asserts that by means of them, and on the condition that the office of priest to Demeter and Proserpine should remain in his family,[3] he led his countrymen back to Gela. It is

(Dion. Hal. vi. 70) is nothing but a poor duplication of the patrician of the same name, the liberator of Rome, who, as Mommsen says, is himself quite probably apocryphal (see Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch.*, I, p. 111).

[1] Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsr.*, III, p. 144, n. 1.

[2] Niese, *De annalibus Rom. observationes* (Marburgi, 1886), pp. vi ff.; cf. my *Storia di Roma*, pp. 532 ff.

[3] Herodot. vii. 153. The following words should be noted: *τούτους ὦν ὁ Τηλίνης κατήγαγε ἐς Γέλην, ἔχων οὐδεμίαν ἀνδρῶν δύναμιν, ἀλλ' ἱρὰ τούτων τῶν θεῶν. ὅθεν δὲ αὐτὰ ἔλαβε ἢ αὐτὸς ἐκτήσατο, τοῦτο οὐκ ἔχω εἴπαι. Τούτοισι δ' ὦν πίσυνος ἐὼν κατήγαγε.* Possibly in place of *ἐκτήσατο* we should read *ἐχρήσατο.* That the infernal deities mentioned in this connection were Demeter and Persephone does not require demonstration. At the most it will suffice to recall that Gelo, the descendant of Telines, was a priest of these two goddesses (Pind. *Ol.* vi, vss. 158–60; Phil. and Timaeus ad Sch. ad loc.). A priest Telinus is mentioned in an inscription of Phintias of the Geloans (see Kaibel, *Inscr. Gr., Sic. et It.*, 258).

clear that we have here to deal with a union of historical fact and legend. Herodotus also tells us that the ancestor of the family of Gelo who accompanied Antiphemus and the Lindians when they came to Sicily and founded Gela, was ἐκ νήσου Τήλου τῆς ἐπὶ Τριοπίῳ κειμένης. But *Telines* signifies "the man from Telos," and it is natural to suspect that, much more than being one of the ancestors of Gelo, he was the very ancestor who came from that island. The observation of Herodotus that Telos was opposite Cape Triopium is also important, since the cult of Demeter and Persephone existed on this cape at an early period.[1] On the other hand, that legends were connected with Telines is shown by the same words of Herodotus. After relating how Telines brought his countrymen back to Gela by means of the ἱρά of the two goddesses, he marvels how this could have been done by a man whom the Sicilian colonists called weak and effeminate. It is clear that this later assertion arose from an erroneous derivation of τηλίνης from θῆλυς.

Thus we see that the cult of Demeter and Persephone in Rhodian Gela was derived from that of Cape Triopium, opposite Rhodes and Telos, and that the account in Herodotus contains simply a legend which pretends to explain why the office of priest of these goddesses was hereditary in the family of the Deinomenids, who were descendants of the more or less historical Telines. It is not our purpose, however, to examine further into the origin and nature of this legend in connection with the history of Sicily. For our purpose it is more important to notice the similarity, or rather the almost exact correspondence, which exists between the secession of the Geloans to Mactorium and the first secession of the Roman plebs. An accurate examination of the two narratives will further show that we have to deal, not with two analogous events, but with a single legend.[2]

[1] C. O. Müller, *Die Doriker*, I², p. 404; Preller, *op. cit.*, I³, pp. 621, 638; cf. Sch. Pind. *Pyth.*, II, 27; Pind. *Ol.* vi, vs. 98; Ed. Luebbert, *Meletemata in Pindari locos de Hieronis regis sacerdotio Cereali* (Bonnae, 1886–87).

[2] On the other hand, the secession of 369 B. C., which occurred at Sparta upon the arrival of Epaminondas, is historical. About two hundred of the secessionists occupied the hill on which the temple of the Issorian Artemis was located. The

The cult of Ceres, which plays such an important part in the story of Telines and the secession of Gela, is no less intimately connected with the story of the Roman secessions. Whoever injured one of the tribunes or aediles of the plebs who had come into being as a result of the first secession, became *sacer* to Jupiter, and his property was consecrated to Ceres and Persephone. At the temple of Ceres the plebeian aediles, of whom two were later termed *aediles ceriales*, saw to it that the plebs did not lack the grain which from the fifth century on came to Rome, especially from Campania and Sicily. In times of famine they thus enabled the plebs to free themselves from the usury of the patricians, who owned the greater portion of the land. Ceres was the protecting goddess of the plebs, and her cult remained exclusively plebeian. This explains why, according to the Roman tradition, in the same year in which the first secession took place (493 B. C.) the temple of Ceres was dedicated by the Sp. Cassius who by his distribution of the Sicilian grain is said to have aimed at making himself tyrant of Rome, and whose property was consecrated to Ceres, the goddess of plebeian liberty.[1]

sedition was quelled as a result of the presence of mind of Agesilaus, who presented himself to them unarmed, followed by a single servant, and, pretending not to have understood their intentions, gave orders to occupy another strategic point. See Plut. *Ag.* 32. 4 ff.; Polyaen. ii. 1. 14.

[1] See, e. g., Liv. iii. 55. 7; ii. 41. For the tribunate, see the data collected by Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsr.*, II, pp. 261 ff. For the political character of the cult of Ceres at Rome, see Preller-Jordan, *Röm. Myth.*, II, pp. 37 ff.; Marquardt-Wissowa, *Röm. Alterth.*, III², pp. 361 ff. That the plebeian aediles made gifts to Ceres, and that this cult was of a political character, has already been brought out by Schwegler (*op. cit.*, II², pp. 278 ff.). Mommsen (*Röm. Staatsr.*, II, p. 470) does not deny that the word *aedilis*, as Niebuhr thought, may have been derived from the *aedis* of Ceres, but seems to prefer the etymology of Varr. *D. L. L.* v. 81: "qui aedes sacras et privatas procuraret." But these were the later aediles. Mommsen seems to me to err in asserting, in opposition to the theory of the derivation of the name from the *aedis* of Ceres, "dass der Cerestempel doch nicht der Tempel überhaupt war," since the temple of Ceres, whether because the most ancient among those of the plebs, or because of the political and economic significance of the cult, was certainly the plebeian temple *par excellence* in Rome, just as it was in Sicily (see below), whence the Romans received the cult of this divinity. Farther on Mommsen (*loc. cit.*) thinks that after the introduction of the Licinio-Sextian laws in 367, the Roman aedileship assumed the character of the Greek ἀγορανομία.

At Syracuse also, the cult of Ceres does not seem to have been of great importance at first. In the ancient city of the *geomori*, or patricians, the primary deities were Artemis and Athena, honored in Ortygia, and Jupiter Olympus, honored in the Olympieum of Polichna. The temple of Ceres at Rome was near the Circus Maximus, and was therefore at the foot of the Aventine where, according to early tradition, the first secession occurred, and where the second in reality took place. It was also outside the *pomerium* of *Roma quadrata* and of the City of the Seven Hills, and therefore far from the place where the temples of the patrician state were located. In like manner, at Syracuse the temple of the two deities stood in a suburb, the Neapolis, and was founded, not by the geomori, but by a foreigner, the descendant of Telines, who seized the city.[1]

At the time when Gelo made himself master of Syracuse, a secession had occurred in that city. The plebeian party, the *καλλικύριοι*, made up, like the Roman plebs, of various elements, had driven out the geomori, the owners of the land, who therefore corresponded to the Roman patricians. The geomori retired to Casmenae. Gelo, profiting by these discords, proceeded with them toward Syracuse. The populace, says Herodotus, upon his arrival yielded up the city of their own accord.[2] This means that Gelo presented himself as peace-maker and friend of the people; and this is the reason why in his history Diodorus, or rather his source Timaeus, opposed to the later tyrants, such as Dionysius

Nevertheless, if this may be said for the entire Roman commonwealth, it was certainly true of the plebs from the fifth century on, since after 449 B. C (Liv. iii. 55) we see that the official seat and archives of the aediles were located in the temple of Ceres, the goddess of grain.

[1] For the foundation of the temple of Demeter and Persephone at Syracuse, see Diod. xi. 26.

[2] Herodot. vii. 155. It is clear that the Syracusan *καλλικύριοι* were in every respect similar to the Roman plebs, as is correctly conceived by Mommsen (*Röm. Staatsr.*, III, pp. 54 ff.). They were the *δοῦλοι* of the geomori, according to Herodot. (*loc. cit.*,), and were said to be *δοῦλοι τῶν φυγάδων* by Timaeus apud Phot., s. v. *καλλικύριοι*. Aristotle (*loc. cit.*) says they were *παντοδαποί*; cf. Dion. Hal. vi. 62, where the Syracusan *καλλικύριοι* are expressly compared with the Roman plebs.

and Agathocles, the figure of the well-known tyrant and friend of the democracy, who is said to have preserved in part the appearance of a popular government in Syracuse, and who even let it be believed that he was willing to return to the condition of a private citizen.[1] Moreover, that Ceres was the protecting goddess of the Syracusan democracy may be concluded from what is said about the auspicious predictions given by Demeter and Persephone to the Corinthian Timoleon when he set out to free Syracuse from the tyrants,[2] and from the fact that Agathocles was forced, not by the magistrates, but by the people, to take oath in the temple of Demeter, where he swore that he would not attempt to injure the democracy.[3] The significance of the oath of Agathocles, and the reason why he was conducted by the citizens to the temple of Demeter, appear still more clearly when we remember that he inaugurated his political career as demagogue and protector of the plebs.[4]

The first secession of the Roman plebs, in 494–493 B. C., resembles in its essential features the secession of the geomori of Syra-

[1] See Diod. xi. 38. 67; xiv. 66 (Timaeus); xxi. 17; Ael. *V. H.* vi. 11; Polyaen. i. 26. 1.

[2] Plut. *Tim.* 8: *γενομένων δὲ τῶν νεῶν ἑτοίμων καὶ τοῖς στρατιώταις ὧν ἔδει πορισθέντων, αἱ μὲν ἱέρειαι τῆς Κόρης ὄναρ ἔδοξαν ἰδεῖν τὰς θεὰς πρὸς ἀποδημίαν στελλομένας καὶ λεγούσας ὡς Τιμολέοντι μέλλουσι συμπλεῖν εἰς Σικελίαν.* Cf. what Plutarch shortly after has to say concerning the celestial torch which accompanied the ships of Timoleon. To the account of the dream of the priestesses of the deities, Diodorus (xiv. 66) adds that, when Timoleon sailed for Sicily, he named one of his best ships after Demeter and Persephone.

[3] Diod. xix. 5. 4: *παραχθεὶς* [i. e., Agathocles] *εἰς τὸ τῆς Δήμητρος ἱερὸν ὑπὸ τῶν πολιτῶν ὤμοσε μηδὲν ἐναντιωθήσεσθαι τῇ δημοκρατίᾳ.* This is badly told in the compendium of Iust. xxii. 2. 8. According to Hesychius (s. v.), at Syracuse and Tarentum Demeter was termed *ἐπιλυσαμένη*, and this appellation is explained by Hesychius as *ἐλευθερία.* Demeter, as we learn from the inscriptions of Cos (see Paton-Hicks, *The Inscriptions of Cos* [Oxford, 1891], pp. 341 ff.), was the most important goddess among the Pamphylians *ἐν Σιτέᾳ*, one of the three Doric tribes which also existed at Agrigentum (see Kaibel, *Inscr. Gr., It. et Sic.*, No. 952), and which certainly existed at Gela, the metropolis of Agrigentum, and at Syracuse itself. It is possible, as the name would seem to indicate, that this tribe of the Pamphylians was in origin less ancient and honorable than the others.

[4] This is expressly stated by Diod. xix. 3, who speaks of his *δημηγορίαι*, and says that by public discourses he opposed the increasing tyranny of Sosistratus (*ibid.* 5; cf. Iust. xxii. 1. 9).

cuse in 487; with this difference, however, that at Syracuse it was the patricians, and at Rome the plebs, who abandoned the city. From this latter point of view, on the other hand, the situation at Rome and at Gela was exactly the same. If we keep in mind the plebeian or democratic character of Ceres, both in Rome and in Sicily, we understand still better the connection which at first glance seems to exist between the fable of Menenius and the half-fictitious story of Telines.

Unfortunately, Herodotus does not inform us what use Telines made of the sacred objects of the two goddesses. We certainly cannot assert that in his source was related some trifling affair similar to that attributed to Agrippa or to Valerius. At any rate, grain was in antiquity, as it is today, the main source of nourishment of all social classes, and especially so of the less well-to-do both at Rome, where *Ceres* also meant "bread," and at Syracuse, where Demeter was Σιτώ, or "grain."[1] The fable of Menenius Agrippa presupposes that the food there spoken of was the sacred grain of Ceres.

In this connection we may also note that, according to the Roman tradition, during the first secession the plebs were nourished by the mythical Anna Perenna, who is nothing else than the symbol of the ever-recurring year. One of her festivals

[1] Livy (ii. 32. 10) speaks only of *cibus*, but Ovid, in *Fast.* iii. 655 ff., where he relates the story of Anna Perenna in connection with the first secession, after stating that she offered *cibos* to Jupiter, continues: "iam quoque, quem secum tulerant defecerat illos . . . . victus et humanis usibus apta Ceres." Cf. iv. 401; Luc., vs. 152 (Baehrens): "deficit alma Ceres, nec plebes pane potitur," referring to the same fact. See Verg. *Georg.* i. 7; Serv. ad *Georg.* i. 7: "Sabini Cererem panem appellant;" Terent. apud Cic. *De deor. nat.* ii. 60: "sine Cerere et Libero friget Venus." Cf. Auct. ad Herenn. iv. 43; Cic. *De orat.* iii. 167; *De deor. nat.* iii. 41: "cum fruges Cererem vinum Liberum dicemus." Cf. οἶνος=Διόνυσος, Hesych., s. v. For the fact that Demeter was called Σιτώ at Syracuse, see Athen. iii. 109 *a;* x. 416 *b*. For the fact that grain was the principal source of nourishment of the Roman plebs, see Marquardt, *Das Privatleben d. Römer*, 2d ed., pp. 414 ff. In regard to Sicily, where even today grain is the chief source of nourishment of all classes, it will suffice to recall that Demeter and Persephone, the goddesses of grain, were the chief divinities of the island; see Diod. v. 3. 2, 4. 4; xx. 7. 2, ταῖς κατεχούσαις Σικελίαν θεαῖς Δήμητρι καὶ Κόρῃ; Cic. *Verr.* II; iv. 106: "insulam Siciliam totam esse Cereri et Liberae consecratam."

occurred at harvest time, and therefore from this point of view also she may be considered one of the rural divinities comparable to Ceres. At the festival which on the Ides of March was held in honor of Anna Perenna on the Via Flaminia near the Tiber, the plebs banqueted in the open air, got drunk, and sang obscene songs.[1] It is hardly necessary to recall the close parallel between this festival and the one celebrated at Syracuse in honor of Demeter and Persephone, during which the Syracusans banqueted out-of-doors, and, among other things, it was permitted *αἰσχρολογεῖν*.[2]

It is, nevertheless, probable that the Geloan Telines persuaded the plebs of Gela, either by a story of the type of that of Menenius Agrippa, or by a distribution of grain or bread.[3] Of these two hypotheses, the former is perhaps the more probable; but, be that as it may, it is clear that the arguments which Telines derived from the cult and sacred ceremonies pertaining to Ceres must have seemed more persuasive to the plebs than to the aristocracy of Gela.

It seems evident that the same situation existed at Gela and at Rome, and we have therefore to deal with two identical facts rather than with one single fact, or one single legend. It may be noted that in the same manner in which Telines is said to have procured for himself and his descendants the hereditary right to the priesthood of the two goddesses, the office of priest to Dis and Proserpine had become hereditary in the family of the dictator Valerius, who, according to an ancient version known to Cicero and to Livy, himself placated the plebs by means of the same discourse which the commonly accepted version attributed to Menenius Agrippa.[4]

It is a well-known fact that the cult of Ceres was of Greek origin, and that, notwithstanding the Italic name given to the goddess, it always remained foreign. Preller, differing from other

[1] Ovid. *Fast.* iii, vss. 523 ff., 675 ff., 695; cf. Meltzer in Roscher, s. v. Anna Perenna; cf. Schwegler, *op. cit.*, II, p. 241.

[2] Diod. v. 4. 6.

[3] Ovid. *Fast.* i, vs. 671; iv, vss. 409 ff.

[4] See Val. Max. ii. 4. 5; Zosim. ii. 1 ff.; cf. Münzer, *De gente Valeria*, pp. 5 ff. This cult of the Valerii, however, takes its origin from Tarentum and not from Sicily, as we shall see farther on.

scholars, rightly recognizes that it was introduced into Rome from Sicily. As Preller has noted, this appears from the fact that in 133 B. C., when by the commands of the Sibylline books it was necessary to placate the most ancient Ceres, the *decemviri sacris faciundis* made a journey to Enna. Moreover, when the Roman poets sang of the Cerealia and the rape of the goddess, they derived their embellishments from Enna and Sicily.[1] Since, however, there are still some who believe that the cult of Ceres and that of Dionysus or Liber, who is associated with her, were introduced into Rome from the Greek cities of the Hellespont,[2] it is not out of place to recall that Dionysus was associated with Demeter and Persephone, not only in the cities of Lampsacus, Parion, and Cyzicus of Asia Minor, but also in Attica, in the Eleusinian festivals, at Megalopolis,[3] at Sicyon in the Peloponnese,[4] and, according to all probability, also in Sicily.[5] It may be objected that, according to Cicero, the priestesses of Ceres at Rome came almost always either from Velia or from Naples,[6] and that Ceres was worshiped with the Attic-Eleusinian rites at Naples, the city which succeeded Cumae. It was from Cumae that came the Sibylline books which brought about the introduction of the Greek cults into Rome.[7] It should, however, be noted that Cicero, after stating that the priestesses came generally from Velia or Naples, adds: "foederatum sine dubio civitatum." One understands why, at the time of Cicero, Rome should have taken from Velia the priestesses who were to receive Roman citizenship, and not from Syra-

[1] Cic. *Verr.* iv. 108; Ovid. *Fast.* iv. 419 ff.; cf. Preller-Jordan, *Röm. Myth.*, II, p. 40.

[2] Marquardt-Wissowa, *Röm. Staatsverw.*, III², p. 362.

[3] Paus. viii. 31. 5.

[4] Paus. ii. 11. 3.

[5] Preller, *Griech. Myth.*, I³, pp. 584, 633, 645 ff. Concerning the myths which associated Bacchus with Ceres and Proserpine, see Diod. iii. 64; iv. 4; cf. Cic. *De deor. nat.* iii. 58. It is not directly stated that Dionysus was connected with the cult of Demeter and Persephone at Syracuse, but it should be noted that, according to Cicero (*Verr.* iv. 128 ff.), the cult of Liber or Dionysus was associated at Syracuse with that of Aristaeus, who in his turn was connected with that of Demeter, as may be concluded, as it seems to me, from the bee beside the head of Demeter on the coin reproduced by Head, *Hist. num.*, p. 160, Fig. 108.

[6] Cic. *Pro Balbo* 55.

[7] Stat. *Silv.* iv. 8. 50.

PLATE IX

Enna (Castrogiovanni)

cuse, which even at his time was considered a hostile city, and was among those in the charge of the censors.[1] We have, however, a reference to a public priestess of the Roman people who was of Sicilian birth,[2] and it would be unnatural to suppose that this was an isolated fact. The cult of Ceres was practiced in the same manner in Rome, in Sicily, and in Greece.[3] That it came to Rome directly from Sicily is recognized more or less implicitly by various Latin authors,[4] and is also shown by the passage in Pliny where, on the authority of Varro, we read:

> Plastae fuere Damophilus et Gorgasus idem pictores, qui Cereris aedem ad circum maximum utroque genere artis suae excoluerant laudatissimi versibus inscriptis Graece quibus significarent ab dextra opera Damophili esse, ab laeva Gorgasi, ante hanc aedem Tuscanica omnia in aedibus fuisse auctor est Varro.[5]

Therefore, the artists who ornamented the temple of Ceres about 493 B. C., according to the commonly accepted chronology, were Dorians, and it is natural to suppose that the city whence the cult was derived was also Doric. Students of the history of art have often thought that the Damophilus mentioned above was Damo-

[1] That Syracuse, after its capture by Marcellus, was controlled by the censors, I think I have shown in my *Alcune osservazioni sulla storia e sulla aministr. di Sicilia, etc.* (Palermo, 1888), pp. 25 ff. Enna, on the other hand, was tithe-paying (see Cic. *Verr.* II. iii. 100).

[2] *CIL*, VI, 1, 2181: "Capsonia P. f. Maxima Sacerdos Cereri (*sic*) publica populi Romani Sicula."

[3] Cic. *Verr.* II. iv. 99: "sacrarium Cereris est apud Catinensis eadem religione qua Romae, qua in ceteris locis qua prope in toto orbe terrarum."

[4] Cicero (*Verr.* iv. 114), after stating that the *decemviri sacris faciundis* went to Enna to placate the "Cererem antiquissimam," and that the goddess had her seat there, says in connection with the cult of this divinity: "medemini religioni sociorum iudices, conservate vestram; necque enim haec externa vobis est religio neque aliena;" by which he expressly recognizes the Sicilian origin of the cult of Ceres, even though he says shortly after that it was a cult common to all peoples (cf. *ibid.* 99). This is stated even more explicitly by Valerius Maximus (i. 1. 1), who says that the *decemviri sacris faciundis* went to Enna "quonian sacra eius [i. e., Ceres] inde orta credebantur." Thus Solinus (vs. 14 M.), in speaking of Sicily, says: "Ceres inde magistra sationis fructuariae. sic ibidem campus Hennensis." For the connection between Rome and the cult of Aetnean Jupiter, see Diod. xxxiv. 14.

[5] Plin. *N. H.* xxxv. 154.

philus of Himera, the teacher of Zeuxis of Heraclea.[1] It will not do, however, to insist too strenuously on this hypothesis, since from Arnobius[2] we learn that the cult of the Greek Ceres was introduced at Rome shortly before that of the Mater Deorum, and thus toward the end of the third century B. C. This much is certain, at any rate, that about 396 B.C. the Carthaginians adopted from Sicily the cult of Demeter and Persephone, as an expiation for having sacked their temples at Syracuse, and that the priests, as at Rome, were Greeks.[3] It would seem that the Etruscans also received this cult from Sicily,[4] and it is most natural that the Roman plebs should have learned to honor the foremost goddess of the island whence from the fifth century on, as we shall see shortly, they were accustomed to receive the best quality of grain at a relatively low price.

From the above it seems probable that the particulars of the account of the first secession were taken over from the Sicilian legend, which penetrated to Rome together with the cult of Ceres. Possibly, together with the first priest, the Siceliot artists may have spread the story of the pious and clever Telines. Be that as it may, however, it seems certain that, just as the introduction of the cult of Demeter at Rome was responsible for the arrival of the Greek artists who decorated the temple of the goddess, so it also caused the Geloan-Syracusan legend to penetrate into Roman history, in the same way in which the introduction of other cults caused the penetration of other legends. Of less importance, possibly, is the fact that together with the cult of Ceres came the myth of the Thessalian Cephalus and his fox-hunt, and that with the cult of Juno was connected the Greek legend of Tutela or Philotis.[5] For

[1] Plin. *N. H.* xxxv. 61; cf. Brunn, *Gesch. d. griech. Künstler*, I, p. 370.

[2] Arnob. *Adv. nat.* ii. 62.

[3] Diod. xiv. 63. 76.

[4] Bugge (*Beiträge zur Erforschung d. etrusk. Sprache* [Stuttgart, 1883], pp. 4 ff.) would derive this from the inscription Oamr annat, or Demeter Hennensis.

[5] For the legend of Cephalus, see Preller-Jordan, *Röm. Myth.*, I, p. 43; *Griech. Myth.*, II³, p. 147. For Tutela or Philotis and Juno Caprotina, see Preller-Jordan, I, p. 286. The fable of Tutela or Philotis, who saved the Roman matrons from the attentions of the Latins at the time of the invasion of the Gauls (Plut. *Rom.* 29; *Cam.* 33; Polyaen. viii. 30), is nothing but a Greek legend transplanted into Latium

our argument it is worth while recalling that the introduction of the cult of Castor and Pollux gave rise to the legend of their appearance at the battle of Lake Regillus. The legend, as has often been noted, is borrowed bodily from the legend connected with the battle of the Sagras, fought in the sixth century between the inhabitants of Locri and Croton.[1] It is also worthy of note that the same Postumius who in 496, as a consequence of victory in the battle of Lake Regillus, is said to have vowed a temple to Castor and Pollux,[2] in the same year, on account of a famine and plague, is said to have vowed another to Ceres.[3] We shall see shortly why, according to tradition, the temple of Ceres was vowed by Postumius three years before the secession of the plebs in 493, instead of in 493 itself, in which year it is said to have been dedicated by Sp. Cassius.[4] In the meantime let us note that, according to the Roman annals, after the first secession and the dedication of the temple of Ceres, followed the famine which in 491 B. C. caused the sending of an embassy in search of Sicilian grain, and also led to the subsequent process against Coriolanus, who opposed its distribution to the plebs, and finally brought about the condemnation of Sp. Cassius, who in his last consulship, in 486, is said to have proposed the distribution of such Sicilian grain to the plebs.[5] Thus the Sicilian grain figures in a number of facts which are closely connected in every respect, including chronological order. But, just as there is no truth, as

as the name Philotis shows. Polyaenus narrates similar legends in regard to the Milesians when fighting against Naxos (viii. 36) and to the Melians against the Carians (viii. 14). Greek and Athenian is also the legend connected with the construction of the temple of Pietas at Rome, which was dedicated in 191, after the victory of Acilius Glabrio at Thermopylae (see Preller-Jordan, *Röm. Myth.*, II, p. 263).

[1] Preller-Jordan. *Röm. Myth.*, II, p. 300. This argument is again treated by Albert, *Le culte de Castor et Pollux en Italie* (Paris, 1883), pp. 8 ff., who shows that the cult of these deities was in every respect similar to that attributed to Cyrene and to Magna Graecia.

[2] Dion. Hal. vi. 13; cf. the coins of the Postumii Albini, Babelon, *op. cit.*, II, p. 379.

[3] Dion. Hal. vi. 17 (258 B. C.); Tac. *Ann.* ii. 49.

[4] Dion. Hal. vi. 94; 493 B. C.=261 Varr.

[5] Liv. ii. 33 ff.; Dion. Hal. vi. 94 ff.; vii. 1 ff.

Mommsen especially has shown, in the account of the agrarian laws, or better agrarian propositions, of Sp. Cassius, and in that of the action and banishment of Coriolanus, so may also the stories about the dedication of the temple of Ceres in 493, and the first secession of the plebs in the same year, be declared to be false.

In the first place, according to Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who in regard to the founding of Rome follows a reckoning based in the main on that formerly accepted by Cato, the first secession occurred in 493–92;[1] in 492 the temple to Ceres was dedicated by Sp. Cassius;[2] and in 491 the embassy was dispatched to procure grain from Sicily.[3] It is a question from what Siceliot city this grain came. Livy has nothing to say on this subject. Licinius Macer, Gellius, and many other Roman annalists assert that it was sent by Dionysius of Syracuse.[4] This is a gross anachronism, on which account Dionysius, after having noted that Licinius, Gellius, and almost all other writers, placed this embassy in the seventeenth year after the expulsion of the kings,[5] concludes that in place of Dionysius should be substituted Gelo, who in 491 had succeeded Hippocrates of Gela. He also supposes that in the earliest annals reference had been made merely to an embassy sent to Sicily, and to a gift of grain made to the Romans by a tyrant.[6]

It is true that in 492–91 B. C. Gelo succeeded Hippocrates, but only in the command of Gela, and it is improbable that grain was sought at Gela rather than at Syracuse or Catana, the Roman annalists to the contrary notwithstanding. Gelo did not obtain control of Syracuse till after 487.[7] The two above-mentioned dates were often confused in ancient times, and some even asserted that Gela became master of Syracuse in Ol. 72, 2 = 491–90 B. C.[8] More-

[1] Dion. Hal. vi. 45 ff. [2] Dion. Hal. vi. 94. [3] Dion. Hal. vii. 1.

[4] Dion. Hal. vii. 1: *ὡς Λικίννιος γέγραφε καὶ Γέλλιος καὶ ἄλλοι συχνοὶ τῶν Ῥωμαίων συγγραφέων.*

[5] Dion. Hal., *ibid.*, *ὡς οὗτοί τε καὶ οἱ ἄλλοι σχεδὸν ἅπαντες συγγραφεῖς ὁμολογοῦσι.*

[6] *Ibid.*: *ὁ πρῶτος ἐν ταῖς χρονογραφίαις τοῦτο κατοχωρίσας.*

[7] For the chronology of Hippocrates of Gela and of the Deinomenids at Syracuse, see Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.*, II, p. 249, n. 1.

[8] Paus. vi. 9. 4.

over, as we know, and as Dionysius expressly states, Fabius Pictor, the earliest Roman annalist fixed the year of the founding of Rome as Ol. 8, 1 – 748–47,[1] and according to all probability placed the first year of the Republic in 503–2.[2] Subtracting, however, 17 years from 503, we come to 486, the year following the one in which Gelo is said to have commenced to reign at Syracuse. To this should be added that in 493–92, the time of the first secession of the Roman plebs, Hippocrates of Gela, the predecessor of Gelo, came very near obtaining possession of Syracuse on account of a contest between the geomori and the plebs.[3] But, whether the Roman annalists took as their point of departure the first Syracusan secession of 493 or the second of 487; whether they took the year when Gelo succeeded Hippocrates at Gela, or that in which he became master of Syracuse, it seems clear that this pretended embassy is connected with the history of Syracuse. It seems impossible that the first secession, the tribunate of the plebs connected with it, the temple of Ceres which is also connected with the secessions and with the liberty of the plebs, and, finally, the distribution of the Sicilian grain desired by Sp. Cassius, the founder of the temple of Ceres, could all have happened precisely in the years, or in the year, in which Gelo, priest of Demeter and Persephone, and builder of their temple at Syracuse, obtained possession of that city as the result of a secession. We have to deal with no casual, but with an intentional, synchronism, established by the early Greek or Roman historians, who, as we shall see later, were seeking a parallelism between the history of Rome and that of Syracuse.[4] This is rendered all

[1] Fab. Pict. apud Dion. Hal. i. 74.

[2] Holzapfel, *Röm. Chronologie*, pp. 182 ff. There are many difficulties connected with this and similar questions of chronology. If I limit myself to quoting this hypothesis of Holzapfel, it is because his method, in spite of what is said by others (such as Soltau), seems on the whole correct. A minute discussion of any one of these dates cannot be made without a discussion of the entire chronology of the Republic, and this I hope to undertake at some future date. Here it would be out of place.

[3] Diod. x. 27; cf. Herodot. vii. 154.

[4] It is worthy of note that Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who is generally disposed to believe in the truth of the early history of Rome, notes the synchronism

the more certain by the consideration that the fable of Menenius Agrippa and the story of the first secession of the Roman plebs, seem to be a repetition of the tale related in regard to Telines of Gela, the city which, between 493 and 487, through its tyrants became mistress of Syracuse, and later, through Gelo, became her subject.

That the temple of Ceres was vowed in 496 by the dictator A. Postumius, in the same year in which he is said to have dedicated the temple of Castor and Pollux, is in itself improbable. This improbability is increased if we remember that the temple of Saturn is also said to have been dedicated in 496,[1] and that of Mercury in 495.[2] We know that the temples of the other Greek cults which were introduced into Rome as a result of the advice given by the Sibylline books were vowed and dedicated at much greater intervals and as a result of distinct events. Thus, in 431 a temple was dedicated to Apollo, who had hitherto, as it seems, possessed only a *sacellum* in the Flaminian fields. In 291 the cult of Aesculapius was introduced; after 217 came that of Venus Erycina; and, finally, in 204 that of the Mater Deorum.[3]

between the secession of the Syracusan καλλικύριοι in 493–92 at the time of Hippocrates, and that of 493–92 at Rome. In speaking of the first secession, he makes one of his characters, Appius Claudius (vi. 62), recall the various secessions in which the aristocrats had driven forth the plebs: ὡς ἐν πολλαῖς ἄλλαις καὶ τελευταῖα ἐν Συρακούσαις where the geomori πρὸς τῶν πελατῶν ἐξηλάθησαν. Dionysius, who believes in the historicity of the two events, here proceeds just as he does when he asserts that, in connection with the killing of the citizens of Gabii, Tarquin the Proud made use, for illustration, of the counsel given by Thrasybulus to Periander (Herodot. v. 92), without showing a perception of the fact that one had to deal, not with an imitation on the part of Tarquinius, but with the infiltration of an event from the history (or pseudo-history) of Greece into the pseudo-history of Rome. This error has, however, its useful side. We have already learned from Herodotus (cf. Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.*, II, p. 254) that Hippocrates had tried to gain possession of Syracuse about 493. The passage just quoted from Dionysius confirms this opinion, and, compared with Herodot. vii. 154 f. and Diod. x. 27, shows that both in 493 and in 487 we have to deal with the same sedition between *geomori* and καλλικύριοι, or between patricians and plebs.

[1] Liv. ii. 21; Dion. Hal. vi. 1.

[2] Liv. ii. 21, 27. Livy recounts the same fact twice, according to two different versions.

[3] See the passages collected by Marquardt-Wissowa, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung*, III², pp. 358 ff.

The legend which connects the mythical victory of Lake Regillus with the dictator A. Postumius Regillensis, and with the cult of Castor and Pollux, is of aristocratic character. Into relation with it, and with the cult after 304 at least, must be brought the patrician festival of the *transvectio equitum*.[1] The cult of Ceres on the other hand, as we have stated, was exclusively plebeian. It was most natural, and quite in accordance with the tendency of the earliest Roman annals, that the plebeian annalists should have attributed to the cult of Ceres an origin as old as that of Castor and Pollux, which had already been received among the *sacra* by the patricians of early Rome.[2] One of the two versions given by Livy of the dedication of the temple of Mercury in 495 B. C. shows that the history of these cults was falsified for partisan purposes. The temple could have been dedicated only by a magistrate and not by the primipilaris Letorius.[3] That the dictator Postumius did not really dedicate the temple of Ceres (aside from the reasons for supposing him a non-historical character) seems evident from the same annalistic tradition which says that the temple of Castor and Pollux was dedicated in 484 by the son of Postumius nominated expressly as *duumvir aedi dedicandae*, and that the temple of Ceres was dedicated in the same year as the first secession, not by this same person, as one would expect, but by the consul Sp. Cassius, who in his last consulship, as the tradition goes, had proposed to distribute the grain from Sicily.

The statements concerning the consul Sp. Cassius are especially important, because he, according to the unanimous Roman tradition, perished in an attempt to become tyrant.[4] His houses were destroyed, and in their place arose the temple of the goddess Tellus,

[1] Preller-Jordan, *Röm. Myth.*, II, pp. 300 ff.

[2] The fact that the cult of the Dioscuri, as is shown by the legend of Lake Regillus, came to Rome from Magna Graecia, may have contributed to associate the two cults. At Locri, the city which won the victory at the Sagras, the cult of Demeter was associated with that of the Dioscuri (cf. Petersen, *Röm. Mitth.*, 1890, p. 219). See Klüber in the *Berl. Phil. Wochenschr.*, 1883, p. 576, for the fact that just as in the temple of Ceres were the plebeian archives, so in the temple of Castor were other non-plebeian archives.

[3] See Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht*, II , p. 602, n. 7.

[4] Mommsen, *Röm. Forschungen*, I, p. 173; cf. my *Storia di Roma*, I, pp. 504 ff.

who became identified with Ceres.[1] According to a tradition in Livy, the father of Cassius killed his son because he was aiming to become tyrant, and from the proceeds of his property dedicated a statue to Ceres.[2] Finally, to the annalist Piso, this same Cassius is said to have placed a statue of himself in front of the temple of Tellus.[3] All of these legends constantly bring Sp. Cassius into relation with Ceres.[4] It is especially worthy of note, however, that while, according to the versions of Livy and Dion Cassius, he was consul in 493, the year when he dedicated the temple of Ceres, according to another version, known to Valerius Maximus and Dion Cassius, he was one of the nine tribunes of the plebs who were burned in the forum by their colleague Mucius, because they had not abdicated, but had conspired against the liberty of the people.[5] This tradition, which makes Sp. Cassius a tribune of the plebs instead of a consul, presupposes the number of ten tribunes. According to Livy and Dionysius, the number of tribunes, already increased in 471 (=469), are said not to have reached ten until 457 (=455).[6] But if, with Niese, we consider how uncertain were the names and the number of the tribunes which tradition records in connection with the first secession, and if we keep in mind the fact that Diodorus places the institution of the tribunes in the year 466 (Diod. =471 Liv.),[7] the year in which the Publilian law was approved, and in which, according to certain traditions, the number of tribunes was increased,[8] we must admit

[1] Ovid, *Fast.* i, vs. 671; Horace, *Carm. saec.* 29; Liv. xli. 28. The temple of Tellus on the Carinae was possibly also dedicated to Ceres. Cf. Plin. *N. H.* xxxiv. 15, 30; Preller-Jordan, *Röm. Myth.*, II, pp. 2 ff.; Marquardt-Wissowa, *op. cit.*, p. 586. Cf. Sch Eurip ad *Phon.* 693, ἡ δὲ Δήμητηρ καὶ Γῆ καλεῖται. In the temple of Demeter and Kore at Patrae in Achaia was a statue of Γῆ; see Paus. vii. 21. 11.

[2] Liv. ii. 41. 10.

[3] Pison. Frug. apud Plin. *N. H.* xxxiv. 30; cf. Mommsen, *loc. cit.*, p. 167.

[4] Cf. the coins of the Cassii with the heads of Ceres, or of Liber and Libera; see Babelon, I, pp. 327, 329.

[5] Val. Max. vi. 3. 2; Dion Cass., fr. 21. 1; Zonar. vii. 17; cf. Mommsen, *loc. cit.*, pp. 168 ff.

[6] Liv. iii. 30; Dion. Hal. x. 30. [7] Diod. xi. 68. 7; cf. Niese, *loc cit.*

[8] Liv. ii. 58.

that the version which made Sp. Cassius a tribune of the plebs fixed the date between 471 and 457 B. C. Dion Cassius mentions it after having recorded the decimation of the Roman army by a certain Appius Claudius in 471, and after the approbation of the Publilian law regarding tribal elections and augmenting the number of tribunes, but before the consulate of Minucius in 458 B. C.[1]

The consul Sp. Cassius and the tribune Sp. Cassius are a single individual, whose history, as Mommsen recognized, was set forth in two different versions, one patrician and one plebeian. In both versions he is closely connected with the cult of Ceres. The consul, however, is said to have dedicated the temple of the goddess in 493, while the tribune is not mentioned until after the year 471. In this also we have traces of the secessions of the plebs,[2] although the second date must be brought still farther forward. According to Diodorus (whom, as a result of the investigations of Niebuhr and Mommsen, everyone admits to be an excellent source, and even superior to Dionysius and Livy for the earliest history of Rome), it was not until after the second secession which overthrew the decemvirate that they inflicted on tribunes who would not abdicate the dreadful punishment which was meted out to Sp. Cassius and his eight colleagues. This second secession is placed by Diodorus in 443 B. C.,[3] the year in which Livy puts the secession of Ardea, which is in reality a reduplication of the one at Rome.[4] This argument receives additional support from the fact, as Niebuhr and Mommsen both admit, that the punishment to which Diodorus alludes was connected with the proposed law of Trebonius, which, according to the chronology of Varro, was approved in 448,[5] but which, according to the *Fasti* of Diodorus, was proposed in 441 B. C.[6]

[1] Dion Cass., *loc. cit.;* cf. Liv. ii. 59; iii. 25.

[2] Liv. ii. 58. 3: "Volscum Aequicumque inter seditionem Romanam est bellum coortum. Vastaverant agros ut si qua secessio plebis fieret ad se receptum haberet."

[3] Diod. xii. 25. 3.

[4] See Livy (iv. 9), who repeats the story of Virginia in regard to Ardea. I shall later speak of the historical and chronological importance of this reduplication of a single legend.

[5] Liv. iii. 65; Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsr.*, II², p. 267, n. 6. [6] Diod. xii. 27.

Diodorus asserts that in 466 B. C. (=471 Liv.) *ἅμα δὲ τούτοις πραττομένοις ἐν τῇ Ῥώμῃ τότε πρώτως κατιστάθησαν δήμαρχοι.* That this means, not that the tribunes were then augmented in number, as Livy says,[1] but that the tribunate then came into existence, we may admit with Niese; but it does not follow from this that the date is historical. It has escaped attention that Diodorus speaks of this immediately after narrating the expulsion of the Deinomenid Thrasybulus—an event of the greatest importance, not only for Syracuse, but for all the Siceliot cities which reclaimed their liberty and re-established democratic government. At Syracuse this glad event gave rise to the institution of an annual festival in honor of Zeus Eleutherius, or protector of liberty.[2]

This coincidence between the memorable year when Thrasybulus, the brother of Gelo and Hiero, was expelled, and the event which, according to Diodorus, signaled the establishment of the tribunate at Rome, is worthy of note. In the same manner in which Syracuse freed herself from the tyranny of the Deinomenids, the Roman plebs shook off the yoke of the patricians. Unfortunately, this evidence is similar to that already noted regarding the simultaneous introduction of the cult of Ceres at Syracuse and at Rome, and, instead of offering material for a consideration of the parallel historical and constitutional development of the famous Siceliot city, and of the future ruler of the world, it is merely a synchronism which was deliberately sought for by an annalist who wished to bring the history of Rome into relation with that of Syracuse. That the synchronism is not merely casual is shown by the fact that in the same way that the legends of Menenius and Valerius and the cult of Ceres have a purely Geloan-Siceliot origin, the tribunate itself finds a parallel in a Syracusan magistracy which we find in force in the fifth century.

At Corcyra, like Syracuse a Corinthian colony, as early as the

[1] Liv. ii 58; cf. Meyer (*Rhein Mus.*, XXXVII [1882], p. 617), who believes that the source of Diodorus spoke of the institution of the tribunate in 493.

[2] Diod. xi. 72: *κατὰ δὲ τὴν Σικελίαν ἄρτι καταλελυμένης τῆς ἐν ταῖς Συρακούσαις τυραννίδος καὶ πασῶν τῶν κατὰ τὴν νῆσον πόλεων ἠλευθερωμένων πολλὴν ἐπίδοσιν ἐλάμβανεν ἡ συμπᾶσα Σικελία πρὸς εὐδαιμονίαν.* Cf. 76.

fifth century the plebs were led by προστάται τοῦ δήμου, who during the secessions deliberated in the name of the people in opposition to the aristocratic party.[1] At Syracuse, after the time of the second Athenian expedition, about 415, we see Athenagoras, προστάτης τοῦ δήμου, opposing the propositions of Hermocrates, one of the generals of the aristocratic party, and denouncing to the plebs the proposals of the aristocratic youths who would not brook democratic equality.[2] Diocles, the adversary of Hermocrates, seems to have been a leader of the democratic party; and so were probably at first also Dionysius and Agathocles, who commenced their political career by attacking as demagogues the leaders of the aristocratic party.[3] Unless I am mistaken, Laphistius and Demenetus too were προστάται. It is recorded by Plutarch[4] that, by means of accusations in the assembly, they wished to make

[1] Thuc. iii. 75 ff.; iv. 46; Aen. Tact. xi. 15. The narratives of Aeneas Tacticus in regard to Corcyra remind somewhat of the alleged historical incident of the plebeian maltreated by his patrician creditor, which Livy vividly relates (i. 23. 3). The fact as set forth by Aeneas has a comic touch, and is possibly historical. The dramatic emphasis of the Roman historian is certainly the result of late pragmatic and pseudo-historical speculation. Another, and certainly historical, fact of this nature is found in Plut. *Dion.* 34.

[2] Thuc. vi. 35. That the προστάτης τοῦ δήμου of Syracuse was an institution corresponding to the Roman tribunate was noted by Giardelli (*Saggio di antichità pubbliche siracusane* [Palermo, 1887], p. 89), who, however, overlooked the fact that the second was derived from the first. The fact that this office appears both at Corcyra and at Syracuse leads one to suspect a common derivation from a Corinthian institution, since we find at Corinth the origin of other institutions of her colonies. (See Beloch, "L'impero siciliano di Dionisio," *Atti dei Lincei* [Rome, 1881], p. 17.) At Corinth as elsewhere were naturally στάσεις, both πλούσιοι and πένητες (see Polyaen. i. 41. 2). At the time of Timoleon the laws of Syracuse were revised by the Corinthians Dionysius and Cephalus (Plut. *Timol.* 24; Diod. xvi. 82).

[3] This is also the opinion of Giardelli (*loc. cit.*). In regard to Agathocles, see above; for Diocles, see Diod. xiii. 19. 4; for Dionysius I, see Diod. xiii. 91. 3; for Theodorus of Syracuse, see Diod. xiv. 64. In regard to other Greek cities, Aristodemus Malacus, tyrant of Cumae, is said to have commenced his career as προστάτης τοῦ δήμου (see Dion. Hal. vii. 4).

[4] *Timol.* 37; cf. Corn. Nep. *Timol.* 5. 2. The Syracusan Sosistratus mentioned by Polyaen. i. 43, at the time of Hermocrates, seems also to have been a προστάτης. The δημηγορεῖν εἰωθότες at Syracuse, about 451 B. C., are mentioned by Diodorus (xi. 92; cf. xii. 57), who calls the προστάται of Corcyra, τοὺς δημαγωρεῖν εἰωθότες καὶ μάλιστα τοῦ δήμου προϊστάσθαι.

Timoleon give an account of his actions. The conduct of Timoleon, as noted by Plutarch, in this regard conforms fairly well with the character and duties of the Roman tribunes. Greek authors in speaking of Roman events translate literally the expression *tribunus plebis* as δήμαρχος. Nevertheless, Zonaras, abbreviating Dion Cassius, although he follows this practice in general, in narrating the story of the first secession says that the plebs nominated two προστάται.[1] This means that the ancients had already noted the correspondence between the two institutions, the Roman and the Greek.

Must we admit that the Romans derived the institution of the tribunate from Syracuse? It seems evident that the office is of Greek origin. Just as the plebeian aediles, who, according to unanimous tradition, came into being at the same time with the tribunes,[2] were in reality an imitation of the ἀγορανόμοι of the various Greek states, and were called σιταγέρται or collectors of grain at Heraclea of Magna Graecia,[3] or σιτοφύλακες at Sicilian Tauromenium,[4] so it seems that the tribunate was an institution borrowed from Greece, where the προστάται τοῦ δήμου occur

[1] Zon. vii. 15; cf. Dion Cass., fr. 16. 13. Mommsen (*Röm. Staatsr.*, III, p. 145, n. 2), taking into account the fact that the Greeks translated *tribunus plebis* as δήμαρχος, and considering that the title of δήμαρχος as head of the state occurs only at Naples, is led to the conclusion that the Romans derived the Greek name for the tribunes from the Campanian Greeks. This conclusion does not seem to me justified. The tribune, in origin at least, was not a state official (Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 81; cf. Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsr.*, II², p. 271), and would not have taken his title from the highest magistracy of the neighboring city. It seems to me that the translation δήμαρχος must have been suggested by the δήμαρχοι or heads of the Attic demes, whose functions closely resembled those of the *tribuni aerarii*, or leaders of the Roman tribes. The name of the tribunes of the plebs could have been derived, as seems to have been the case, from the military tribunes.

[2] Mommsen (*Röm. Staatsr.*, II², p. 487) correctly observes: "Dass die steigende städtische Entwickelung Roms sich an die höhere Civilisation Griechenlands anlehnte, ist natürlich;" and believes that the aediles after 367 B. C. are an imitation of the Greek ἀγορανόμοι. From their very origin, it seems to me, this holds also for the exclusively plebeian aediles.

[3] Kaibel, *Inscr. Graec. Sicil. et It.*, No. 645, I, 110.

[4] *Ibid.*, No. 423. Besides the σιτοφύλακες are mentioned the σιτωνίοι. At Syracuse they were termed ἀγαρανόμοι (*ibid.* 211).

frequently, especially in the Peloponnese at Megara,[1] in Elis,[2] and at Argos.[3] And that the institutions relating to the liberty of the Roman plebs are really of Greek origin is shown by the Greek character of the plebeian cult of Ceres, at whose temple there was an asylum. Such an asylum was an institution totally foreign to Rome, and the idea involved could not even be expressed by a Latin word.[4] It is even asserted that the various asylums in Rome were instituted after the restitution of the tribunate following the fall of the decemvirate.[5] If, then, we are told that the homes of the tribunes had to be kept open day and night as a place of refuge,[6] we come to the simple and natural conclusion that the

[1] Thuc. iv. 66.

[2] Xen. *Hell.* iii. 2. 27, 30.

[3] See in Aen. Tact. xi. 7, where, just as at Corcyra (*ibid.* 13 ff.), the προστάτης appears as a protector of the plebs against the rich. See Gilbert, *Handbuch d. griech. Alterth.*, II, p. 129, for the institution at Tegea in Arcadia. I shall not here investigate whether, as the Epirote (see *op. cit.*, p. 3), these προστάται were of the same nature as the προστάται τοῦ δήμου, mentioned above, nor whether they were protectors of the plebs. The question deserves special treatment, which, I hope, will be accorded both this and other problems pertaining to Greek public procedure. In like manner I pass over for the present the origin of the name and authority of the προστάται, who appear to have been the chief magistrates at Gela (Kaibel, *op. cit.*, 256; cf. for Agrigentum, *ibid.*, 952); here I limit myself to noting that at Athens the ἰσονομία and ἰσαγορία made such an office unnecessary even for the humblest citizen. The προστάτης which was there required by every μέτοικος was for that important class the same as the προστάτης τοῦ δήμου at Syracuse and the tribune at Rome were for the plebs. The points of contact between the Attic metics and the Roman plebs are evident. At the end of the fifth century the majority of the population of the Siceliot cities was composed of foreigners and plebs (ὄχλοις τε γὰρ ξυμμίκτοις πολυανδροῦσι αἱ πόλεις, according to Thuc. vi. 17. 2). From Diod. xiii. 84. 4 we learn that about 406 B. C. Agrigentum contained 20,000 citizens and about 180 κατοικοῦντες ξένοι. These latter are to be compared, not alone with the Attic metics, but also with the *dediticii* and *applicati* who made up a large proportion of the clients and of the Roman plebs.

[4] Varr. apud Non., p. 60 L. M.

[5] Cic *De leg. agr.* ii. 36: "sunt enim loca publica urbis, sunt sacella, quae post restitutam tribuniciam potestatem nemo attigit, quae maiores in urbe partim periculi perfugia esse voluerunt; haec lege tribunicia xviri vendent." Early in the Republic we find that the right of asylum also existed at the temple of the foreign deity Diana, and at that of Vediovis (Lycoreus ?) (see Preller-Jordan, *Röm. Myth.*, I, pp. 155, 264). Possibly the same right existed at the temple of the Furies, whither Gracchus fled (see Plut. *Quaest. Gr.*, 16 ff.).

[6] Plut. *Quaest. Rom.* 81: ὥσπερ λιμὴν καὶ καταφυγὴ τοῖς δεομένοις.

Greek right of asylum was closely connected with the tribunes, whose *sacrosancta potestas* was translated into Greek as ἱερὰ καὶ ἄσυλος ἀρχή.[1] Another Greek, and probably Siceliot, trait is recognized in the fact that at Rome the tribunate was joined, not only with the cult of Ceres, but also with that of Jupiter, in the same way that at Syracuse the protecting divinities of liberty were Demeter and Zeus Eleutherius, whose cult, according to Diodorus, arose in 463, three years after the expulsion of the tyrants from Syracuse, and (also according to Diodorus) after the institution of the tribunate at Rome.[2]

It should be recalled, finally, that at least after the first century B. C., in Rome as well as in those colonies which possessed Italic rights, a statue representing Marsyas was the symbol of liberty.[3]

[1] Said by Dion. Hal. vi. 89, in connection with the institution of the tribunate. He also states, shortly after, that the property of those who wronged the tribunes became sacred to Ceres (see Plut. *Ti. Graec.* 15, ἱερὸν τὸν δήμαρχον εἶναι καὶ ἄσυλον; and cf. the bilingual urban inscription, *CIL*, VI, 824, "ἱερὸν καὶ ἄσυλον sacrum"). The name *aedilis* (see above, p. 245, note 1) likewise shows the sacred character of this magistracy, which, like the tribunate, was closely connected with the cult of Ceres. For Hermion see Paus. ii. 35; Phot. *Lex.*, p. 212 N.

[2] Zeus Eleutherius, whose cult arose in 463 (Diod. xi. 72), is often represented on Syracusan coins (see Poole, *Cat., etc.*, "Sicily," pp. 184 ff.), and is also found at Agyrium and Eryx (*ibid.*, pp. 26, 63). To judge from the coins, this cult became very important in Sicily in the fourth century after the undertaking of Timoleon. The cult of Jupiter is associated with that of Ceres and Liber (Persephone) in the laws of Horatius and Valerius, which, according to tradition, were approved after the fall of the decemvirate (Liv. iii. 55. 8; 449 B. C). Moreover, near the temple of Jupiter Capitolinus the tribal assemblies met, in which after the law of 471 B. C. the tribunes were elected (see Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsr.*, II², p. 267; III, p. 381). The tribunes preserved their documents in the Capitol (*ibid.*, II, p. 282), while, according to the laws of Horatius and Valerius, the *senatus consulta* were preserved by the aediles in the temple of Ceres (Liv., *loc. cit.*, 13). It is worthy of note that during the plebeian games (November 4–17) on the Aventine, held, as the ancients said, either in memory of the expulsion of the kings, or else "pro reconciliatione plebis post secessionem in Aventinum" (Asc. in Cic. *Verr.*, p. 143), occurred the *epulum Iovis* celebrated by the plebs on the Ides of that month (November 13; see Preller-Jordan, *Röm. Myth.*, II, p. 227). Moreover, on the Ides of September, the time of the *epulum Jovis* of the patricians, the plebs celebrated the rural festival of Ceres (Plin. *Epist.* ix. 39).

[3] Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsr.*, III, pp. 809 ff. For the connection of the statue of Marsyas with the tribunes of the plebs, see Plin. *N. H.* xxi. 8. Possibly the picture of Zeuxis which represented Marsyas bound, and which was exhibited in

This custom is evidently derived from a Greek city. In precisely the same way, about a hundred years ago, with the spreading of the ideas and principles of the French Revolution the practice of planting liberty poles became prevalent throughout Europe. Marsyas, like Silenus, was one of the followers of Dionysus, and was even identified by Herodotus[1] with Silenus. The Romans seem to have learned the form *silanus* from the Dorian Greeks of Sicily, and it is especially worthy of note that on the coins of several Siceliot cities is represented Marsyas or Silenus—a fact which can hardly be regarded as anything else than a typification of the liberty of democratic government.[2]

the temple of Concord in Rome (Plin. *N. H.* xxxv. 66), was placed there as a symbol of restrained political license. According to Gellianus (Gellius?), the Marsi thought their name was derived from the Lydian Marsyas (Plin. *N. H.* iii. 108). This may be a late derivation, and a substitution of Marsyas for Mars; but I am inclined to believe that it was based on the cult of Marsyas. A coin of the Umbrian Tuder which is later than the fourth century represents Silenus or Marsyas (see Garrucci, *Mon. d. It. ant.*, Plate LXXV, Fig. 17). The type of this coin is purely Greek; and, since the coins of Tuder show close relations with the shores of the Adriatic which were then occupied by Greeks from Magna Graecia and Sicily (see below), it is probably not accidental that the coin seems little less than an imitation of one from Metapontum reproduced by Garrucci, *op. cit.*, Plate CV, Fig. 35.

[1] Herodot. vii. 26.

[2] Silenus and Dionysus occur together as one of the two symbols on the beautiful coins of Naxos of the fifth century (see Poole, *Cat. Br. Mus.*, "Sicily," p. 118). From this point of view the Naxian coins are identical with the Roman coins of the Marcii of the first century, having on one side the head of Liber or Dionysus, and on the other Silenus-Marsyas (Babelon, II, p. 95). Marsyas or Silenus riding an ass is represented on coins of Nacona (Poole, *op. cit.*, p. 117) and Silenus at Catana (*ibid.*, pp. 42, 49). It is worth mentioning that the proagorus, or supreme magistrate, at Catana at the time of Cicero was called Dionysiarchus (Cic. *Verr.* iv. 50). This name is interesting, not only because at Catana the public cult of Dionysus is expressed on the coins (Poole, *op. cit.*, p. 62), but also because we have every reason to believe that there, as at Syracuse (Cic. *Verr.* ii. 127), the supreme magistrate and priest was selected from certain families which had a hereditary right to the position. It seems to me, as to Beloch (*op. cit.*, p. 15), that Cicero, in referring to Syracuse with the words "ex tribus generibus," wished to indicate *γένη* and not *φυλαί*, as most modern writers hold. At Crete also the *κόσμιοι* were drawn *ἐκ τινῶν γενῶν* (Arist. *Polit.* ii. 7, p. 1272 Bk.). On a coin of Himera, and therefore not later than 409, Silenus stands beside a fountain. This should be noted in connection with the fact that the Romans gave the name of *Silani* to grotesque fountain masks whence water issued (see Lucr. vi, vs. 1263). The cult of Silenus seems to have been of special importance in the Pelo-

If we keep in mind what has just been said concerning the Siceliot origin of the cult of Ceres at Rome, with the added fact that among the Romans Liber, just as Dionysus among the Greeks, was associated with the cult of Demeter-Ceres, we understand better how Silenus became the symbol of liberty at Rome, and it seems less strange to assign a purely Sicilian origin to the tribunes and aediles of the plebs, whose intimate connection with the cult of Ceres is certain.

The above will seem strange to those who wish to see in the political institutions of Rome an autonomous development with little contact with neighboring peoples. Nevertheless, that Greek elements had penetrated even into the earliest of Roman institutions is unconditionally admitted by ancient writers in the case of the legislation of the decemvirate, and is also in part admitted by some of the most authoritative of modern writers. Mommsen, for example, recognizes the Greek origin of the Servian military system, and notes the close resemblance between the arrangement of the Roman cavalry and that of Attica.[1] We have also seen that he admits the Greek origin of the functions of the aediles after 367 B. C. Whoever approaches the study of the earliest history of Rome with an unbiased mind, will recognize that, from this point of view, the Rome of which we speak was no different from that of the last centuries of the Republic or the beginning of the Empire.

The city which already in the fifth century had received the cults of Hercules, Apollo, the Dioscuri, Mercury, and Ceres, would not have hesitated to receive political and military institutions from Greece, in the same way that at a later date it received the Phrygian cult of the Magna Mater, and the civic institutions of Alexandria.

The objection may be raised that even if the ancient, and with them modern, writers recognize the dependence of a portion of the

ponnese. At Elis (Paus. vi. 24. 8) he had a temple of his own (cf. Wide, *Lakonische Kulte* [Leipzig, 1893], p. 254), while at other places (Paus., *loc. cit.*) he was associated with Dionysus.

[1] Mommsen, *Röm. Gesch.*, I[6], p. 95; *Röm. Staatsr.*, III, p. 253, n. 2.

political institutions and laws of Rome on those of the Greek peoples, there is never any mention of special dependence upon Syracusan legislation. Such an objection, however, is not valid. When Cicero asserts that certain Roman institutions were similar to those of Corinth, we are at once reminded of the fact that Syracuse was a colony of Corinth.[1] And if Roman tradition admits that the legislation of the decemvirate was modeled after that of Solon, but makes no mention of what was borrowed from the code of Syracuse, it should be noted that in 212 B. C., at the time of Fabius Pictor, Syracuse had been captured by Marcellus and was being severely punished. It became a censorial city, and on the occasion of the process against Verres, Cicero still calls it a *hostium urbem.*[2] From the time when they commenced to write their own history, the Romans must have felt a certain repugnance toward confessing how much they had been aided by the civilization of Syracuse, which during the fifth and fourth centuries had been the most powerful and famous of the Greek cities of the West. For that reason, possibly, no Roman writer mentions the fact that the tribunes and aediles of the plebs were introduced into Rome from Sicily; and for a similar reason, or else because of a sincere admiration, mingled with an interested benevolence and tolerance, as I hope to prove, the Romans exaggerated the influence of the constitution of Solon upon their own legislation. That even in

[1] Cic. *De R. P.* ii. 36.

[2] Cic *Verr.* ii. 14; v. 82 ff, 131. With the words "Syracusanis hostibus" he opposes the Syracusans of his time to the citizens of other allied and associated cities. (See my *op. cit.* on the Roman administration of Sicily, pp. 76 ff.) The objections of Beloch in his otherwise excellent work, *La populazione della Sicilia* [Palermo, 1889], pp. 82 ff., are without value. When Cicero defends the Syracusans, this is due to the fact (*op. cit.*, p. 75) that he does not defend the inhabitants of the censorial city, but rather certain of the many Roman citizens who inhabited the capital of the island. Syracuse was the residence of the praetor and the seat of one of the four judicial assemblies, and was also the home of many "negotiatores cives Romani." That she was punished by Rome is strikingly brought out by the fact that she was treated as was Marseilles by Caesar, and had her territory divided. In the case of Athens this occurred but rarely and to a lesser degree. The censorial communes of the Bidini, Acrenses, Megarenses, Herbessenses, and possibly also of the Tyracinenses, which were still in existence at the beginning of the Empire, were all created at the expense of the territory of Syracuse.

early times, however, they recognized the intellectual superiority of Sicily is shown by the fact that they placed in the Curia a statue of the Sicilian Empedocles, and also one of Pythagoras.[1]

II

Although in general the sources are silent concerning the dependence of certain Roman institutions upon those of Magna Graecia and Sicily, in connection with the pretended embassy of 454 to Athens they admit that the Romans visited the cities of Magna Graecia.[2] It should also be noted that after the beginning of the fifth century, Syracuse was in a position to exercise great influence upon the coast of Latium and Etruria.

Up to the battle of Himera (480 B. C.) Syracuse had not played an important part in the history of the Siceliot and Italiot cities, but after Hiero in 474 had destroyed at Cumae the fleet of the Carthaginians and Etruscans, she became the first maritime power of the western Mediterranean. After the victory of Cumae, Hiero seized Ischia and built there a fortress,[3] and after the expulsion of Thrasybulus, Syracuse never ceased to exercise on an ample scale her hegemony over the shores of the Mediterranean. In 453 (of Diod. = 458 of Varro) the Syracusan admiral Phayllus laid waste the coast of Etruria as far as Elba, and his successor, Apelles, with sixty triremes, not only plundered the Etrurian coast, but pushed as far as Corsica and brought Elba under the control of Syracuse.[4] In 435 and 411 (or 427 and 403) the Romans received grain from Sicily;[5] and if, as seems probable, the statement is authentic that in 396 (Varr. = 393 Diod.) the Lipareans restored to the Romans the tripods which were being sent to Apollo as a thank-offering for the taking of Veii,[6] it should be remembered that the Lipareans were at that period the allies of Syracuse.[7] The Etruscans, in their turn, were enemies of Syracuse at that

[1] For the statue of Empedocles see Diog. Laert. viii. 2. 72; for that of Pythagoras see Plin. *N. H.* xxxiv. 26.

[2] Dion. Hal. x. 51, 54.

[3] Strab. v, p. 548 C.

[4] Diod. xi. 88. Possibly fr. 23 M. of Philistus refers to facts of this nature.

[5] See above, p. 234.

[6] Diod. xiv. 93; Liv. v. 28; Plut. *Cam.* 8.

[7] Diod. xiv. 56. 2; cf. Thuc. iii. 88; Diod. xii. 54. 4.

time, as they had been in 413. For that reason Dionysius I in 384 laid waste the shores of Etruria, where he plundered Pyrgi, the harbor of Caere, and pushed as far as Corsica.[1] The good relations between Rome and Syracuse probably gave rise, as we have seen, to the legend that Siculus came from Rome; and even if there is no truth in the assertions of Gellius, Licinius Macer, and many other Roman annalists, that Dionysius sent a gift of grain to the Romans in the sixteenth year after the expulsion of the kings, they at least presuppose the existence of friendly relations between Rome and Dionysius at Syracuse.

The influence which Sicily, and especially Syracuse, exercised over the coast of Campania, Latium, and Etruria, from the time of the battle of Cumae till the fall of Dionysius II (357 B. C.), was certainly important. According to one legend, Daedalus and the Thespiades betook themselves to Cumae;[2] and, according to another, Cumae was the metropolis of Tritaea in Achaia.[3] This second legend shows that Achaeans and Arcadians had established themselves at Cumae. As at Regium and Himera, Peloponnesan ele-

[1] Diod. xv. 14; Ael. *V. H.* i. 20; Polyaen. v. 2 20; Lucil. apud Serv. ad *Aen.* x. 184. The plundering of the temple of Pyrgi by Dionysius while on his way to Corsica is recorded only by Strabo v, p. 226 C. From that period probably dates the origin of the Συρακόσιος λιμήν on the east coast of Corsica, which is mentioned by Diod. v. 13. 3, and Ptol. iii. 2. 4. If we admit the existence of an alliance between Rome and Syracuse, we understand better why at that time, or at the latest at the time of Dionysius II, the Romans attempted to found a colony on Corsica (see Theophr. *H. P. V.* 9).

[2] Verg. *Aen.* vi. 14 ff.; Sall. apud Serv., *ad loc.;* Diod. v. 15; Fest., s. v. *Roma*, p. 266 M.; Paus. vii. 22. 8.

[3] In regard to Paus. vii 22. 8, I agree with Reitzenstein, *Inedita poetarum Graecorum fragmenta* (Rostock, 1891), p. 10. Moreover, the legend concerning Celbidas, the founder of Tritaea is connected with the belief (Paus. viii. 24. 5) that at Cumae the teeth of the Erymanthian boar were preserved (cf. Garrucci, *Mon. dell' It. ant.*, Plate LXXXIII, Fig. 23). Tritaea was situated on the slopes of Erymanthus. I also agree with Reitzenstein with regard to the Achaean (Arcadian) rites as being connected with the Euboean, and as mentioned by the Sibylline books, which are said to have come from Cumae. In referring to the sacrifice to the Moerae or Parcae, the recently discovered commentaries on the secular games (line 90) mention this Achaean rite as connected with the cults imported into Rome by order of the Sibylline books. I cannot agree, however, with his statements concerning the manner and time of this introduction.

ments may have penetrated to Chalcidian Cumae at a very early period,[1] but it is natural to suppose that this took place to a much greater degree after Hiero and his Peloponnesan mercenaries had occupied Cumae and Ischia.[2] The legend of Daedalus and the Thespiades, who established themselves at Cumae after returning from Sicily and Sardinia, evidently arose as a consequence of the relations with Sicily, where, thanks to the Rhodian Cretan colonists of Gela, such myths had become localized. It was from Gela that the Corinthian Syracusans finally received, through the Deinomenids, the eastern myths which had been inherited from these colonists.

From Sicily likewise the peoples of Etruria received countless impulses toward artistic and political advancement. The coming of the Corinthian Damaratus to Tarquinii, first for commercial and then for political reasons, may well have marked the introduction of Corinthian vases into Etruria. It is well known that from the fifth century on the Dorians of Sicily and Italy exercised great influence on the sacred architecture of Etruria, and, unless I am mistaken, this influence was no less felt in the case of sepulchral architecture. Ancient writers describe with high praise the tomb of Porsenna, which was ornamented with many towers and pyramids. We may form some idea of such tombs from the one of Cucumella now seen near Vulci, and the one between Albano and Aricia, commonly called the tomb of Aruns. However, this

[1] For Regium see, e. g., Antioch. apud Strab. vi, p. 257 C. For the Doric element which participated in the foundation of Zancle, see Thuc. vi. 5. 2.

[2] It seems to me evident that the Sicilian myth of Daedalus and Minos, as connected with Cocalus, king of the Sicani, arose as a result of the founding of Gela by the Cretan and Rhodian colonists. It is worthy of note that the name of the Sican king, Κώκαλος, reappears in the Coan name Κόκκαλος mentioned by Herond. *Mim.* iii. 60 (ed. Crusius). The Siceliot myth concerning the Theban Iolaus is evidently connected with the belief that the ancestors of Theron of Agrigentum came from Telos, opposite Cape Triopium, and were connected with Cadmus and Thebes; see Sch. Pind. *Ol.* ii. 16. 82. But Aenesidemus, the father of Theron, was Geloan, and Agrigentum was also a Geloan colony; from which it appears that we have to deal with cults and myths which are connected with the Thessalian Argive origin of the Rhodians and Cretans who came to Sicily. Thebes was sacred to Persephone (Eurip. *Phoen.*, vss. 494 ff.; cf. Euphor. ad Sch., *loc. cit.*), and so was Sicily (cf. Diod. v. 3. 2).

elaborate variety of tomb, ornamented with towers and pyramids, was in use in Sicily as early as the beginning of the fifth century, and one is even mentioned in connection with Gelo, who died in 478 B. C.[1] The implements used in the Sicilian game of cottabus have been discovered in a tomb, dating probably from the first century, situated near Perugia.[2] Finally, although the Dionysiac orgies which were repressed by the *senatus consultum* of 186 B. C. were more closely connected with Magna Graecia, it may not be out of place to note that it was from Etruria that they penetrated to Rome.[3]

[1] See Helbig, "Sopra la provenienza degli Etruschi," *Annali di Corr. Arch.*, 1884, p. 147, where he confutes the theory of Milchöfer, who thinks that these tombs were derived from those of Lydia. To quote the words of Helbig: "It should be remembered that very little is known of the sepulchral architecture of the regions which are of the most importance in this research, and that we do not know the nature of the mausoleums erected in the sixth centuy B. C. by the noble families of Syracuse and Carthage." I am pleased to note the correctness of this hypothesis, which is substantiated, for example, by Diod. xi. 67, who speaks of the sepulcher of Gelo, called "of the nine towers," which was destroyed by Agathocles. Diodorus (or rather Timaeus) says that the sepulchral monument was destroyed by the Carthaginians, and that the towers were torn down by Agathocles from hatred of Gelo; but it is clear that Agathocles, having noticed that the monument had served as a base of operations for the enemy, demolished the towers because of the danger to the city. We are reminded of the tomb of Simonides which was used by Phoenix, a general of Agrigentum, as a tower in a war against Syracuse (see Suid, s. v. Σιμωνίδης and Ἐπηλυγάζονται), and of the fate of the tomb of Cecilia Metella in mediaeval times. In regard to the pyramids, Helbig cites the one on the road between Argos and Epidaurus (Paus. ii. 25. 7). It is more to our purpose to recall that at the time of Timoleon (the middle of the fourth century), there were erected at Sicilian Agyrium, the native town of Diodorus, τάφους πυραμίδων πολλῶν καὶ μεγάλων διαφόρων ταῖς φιλοτεχνίαις (Diod. xvi. 83. 3; cf. also the pyramidal tombs of horses at Agrigentum, Plin. *N. H.* viii. 155). Moreover, the labyrinth which, according to Varro (apud Plin. *N. H.* xxxvi. 91), was found in the base of the monument of Porsenna, is connected with the legend of Daedalus in Sicily and the West, and with his work in Sicily and also in Sardinia where the turreted *nuraghi* were thought of as having been made by him (Diod. iv. 30. 1, 78). This last tradition arose as a result of the relations which existed between Sardinia and Syracuse from the middle of the fifth to the middle of the fourth century.

[2] *Notizie degli Scavi*, September, 1886. Other facts of this nature might be adduced. Cf. also the relation between Etruscan bucchero ware and the monuments of the Peloponnesus, which is explained as resulting from Siceliot commerce. See Helbig, *Annali del Inst*, 1884, p. 145.

[3] Liv. xxxix. 9. 1 says clearly: "huius mali labes ex Etruria Romam veluti contagione morbi penetravit."

This influence, moreover, was no less felt at Rome itself, as is shown by the cult of Ceres. It seems to me, however, that this cult, and that of Mercury as well, could not have extended thus far before the battle of Cumae. Varro asserts that the temple of Ceres was the first at Rome which was not constructed according to the rules of Etruscan art and religion.[1] The artists Damophilus and Gorgasus who decorated it were Greeks, but we have seen that this Damophilus seems to have been from Himera, and that he could not have come to Rome until about 450, and not in 493 B. C., the year in which, according to tradition, the temple was erected. It was by no means accidental that the builders of the first temple, which was purely Greek in style, should have been Doric, and even Sicilian. If I am not mistaken, this was connected with the battle of Cumae (474 B. C.), which, as will be brought out more in detail, had the effect, not only of overthrowing the sea-power of the Etruscans, but also of substituting the influence of Siceliot, and especially of Syracusan, civilization for that of the Chalcidians of Regium and Cumae, and that of the Phocaeans of Velia and Massilia.[2] Thus it was not by mere chance that about 450 B. C., as a result of the laws of Valerius and Horatius, and after the second secession of the plebs and the fall of the decemvirate, it was established "ut qui tribuni plebis aedilibus iudicibus decemviris nocuisset, eius caput Iovi sacrum esset, familia ad

[1] Plin. *N. H.* xxxv. 154: "ante hanc aedem Tuscanica omnia in aedibus fuisse auctor est Varro."

[2] That the victory of Cumae in 474 B. C. exercised a certain influence on the history of Latium is admitted by Niebuhr (*Röm. Gesch.*, II, pp. 233=187 Isler), and also by Mommsen (*Röm. Gesch.*, I[6], p. 323), who bases his conclusion on the fact that in 474 Veii made a forty-year truce with Rome (Liv. ii. 54. 2). But, aside from the fact that the year 474 of Livy does not correspond to the 474 of Diodorus—who places the battle of Cumae (xi. 51), it is true, in 474, but who records for 469 (xi. 63) the magistrates mentioned by Livy for 474 (of Varro)—the truce of forty years' duration does not seem to me historical. It resembles closely the truce of forty years granted Tarquinii in 351 B. C. (Liv. vii. 22. 6). The first came after the death of the 306 Fabii who were killed at the Cremera by the inhabitants of Veii (478 B. C.; Liv. ii. 50); the second, after the killing by the inhabitants of Tarquinii of 307 warriors led by a Fabius (Liv. vii. 15. 10, in 358 B. C.). Apparently we have to deal with a duplication.

aedem *Cereris, Liberi, Liberaeque* venum iret."[1] Livy adds that the same consuls brought it about that the *senatus consulta* should be taken to the plebeian aediles in the temple of Ceres, and that in the same year were established the asylums connected with the cult of Ceres,[2] which must have been introduced at about the same period.

In the preceding pages we have noted the legendary character of the first secession, which is really a proleptic duplication of the second. It should be noted further that the names of the tribunes mentioned in connection with the Publilian rogation (471 Varr. = 466 Diod.) are the same not only as those of the pretended tribunes of 493, but also as those nominated after the fall of the decemvirate in 449. With these facts in mind we are led to the following conclusions which, if not certain, at least seem probable.

As a result of the victory at Cumae, and the subsequent maritime and commercial expansion of Syracuse, the grain from Sicily competed favorably with that which in time of famine was imported from Etruria and Campania, and which was both inferior in quality and of higher price. From the fifth century on Sicily commenced to be the *cella penaria* and *nutrix plebis Romanae*, as she was called by Cato.[3] The plebs, who derived the greatest benefit from this importation of Sicilian grain, naturally received from Sicily the cult of Ceres, and with the cult arose the temple decorated by Sicilian artists. But the essential character of the cult of Ceres was the protection of the plebs, and for that reason, just as the myth of the Geloan Telines was transformed into the fable of Menenius Agrippa in connection with the first secession, and just as the Siceliot Silenus became the symbol of liberty, so the Romans derived from Syracuse the institution of the tribunes and of the aediles of the plebs—an institution which was closely connected with Demeter, who both at Syracuse and at Rome represented democratic liberty.

On account of falsifications of the annals it is impossible to tell in what year the tribunes and aediles of the plebs were first introduced. It could hardly have been earlier than 466 B. C., and

[1] Liv. iii. 55. 8. [2] Cic. *De leg. agr.* ii. 36. [3] Cat. apud Cic. *Verr.* II. ii. 5.

might easily have been close to 449, or even later. Diodorus fixes the fall of the decemvirate and the restitution of the tribunate in 433–32 B. C.,[1] and Livy places in 443 the story of the secession of Ardea, which is simply a duplication of the Roman secession.[2] We come thus to the same years in which the *lex Canuleia* regarding intermarriage between patricians and plebeians was proposed (445 B. C.),[3] and in which the censorship is said to have arisen (443 B. C.).[4] These coincidences are more important than appears at first glance. The tribune Canuleius did not limit himself in 445 B. C., to the proposition that marriage be permitted between the two classes, but, according to the version of Livy, demanded that one of the consuls be chosen from the plebs.[5] This proposition was not accepted, however, and it was not till 367, according to Livy and other authors, that the measure was finally carried.[6] According to Diodorus, on the other hand, the plebs received this concession in 443–42, after the fall of the decemvirate and the passing of the laws of Horatius and Valerius.[7] We have, therefore, to a certain degree, another element in favor of the date and theory of Diodorus which in recent years have been well sustained by Niese.[8]

[1] Diod. xii. 24 ff.

[2] Liv. iv. 9; cf. my *The Legends of Earlier Roman History* (New York, 1905). It is evident at first glance that this secession is merely a repetition of the story of Virginia and of the second secession of the Roman plebs.

[3] Liv. iv. 6. [4] Liv. iv. 8. [5] Liv. iv. 1. 2.

[6] Liv. vi. 42. 9. According to Burger, *Sechzig Jahre aus d. alt. Gesch. Roms* (Amsterdam, 1891), pp. 188 ff., this occurred as early as 377 B. C.

[7] Diod. xii. 25.

[8] With regard to the character and value of the tradition of Diodorus concerning the second secession and the laws of Valerius and Horatius, I agree with Meyer, *Rhein. Mus.*, XXXVII, pp. 620 ff. I think Niese (*Hermes*, XXIII [1888], p. 423) wrong in accepting this tradition concerning the origin of the plebeian consul. The date in Livy referring to this one of the Licinio-Sextian laws is in the main well confirmed by the Fabius Pictor (apud Gell. *N. A.* v. 4), who places the first plebeian tribune twenty-five years after the taking of Rome by the Gauls. This date seems correct, although it does not harmonize with the theory of Mommsen (*Röm. Forsch.*, II, pp. 221 ff), according to which Fabius Pictor was the source of Diodorus. I agree, on the other hand, with the greater portion of the article of Niese, which shows that the majority of the so-called Licinio-Sextian agrarian laws are really

Owing to the inaccuracy of Roman tradition, it is not possible to determine the precise value of these chronological data, nor just when the tribunate arose. In the final pages of this chapter these questions will again be considered. For the moment let us limit ourselves to noting that, whatever truth there may be in the history of the decemvirate (see below), as a result of its abolition the institution of the tribunes of the plebs was not restored from some earlier period, but made its first appearance at that time. Tradition wished to add dignity to the office by ascribing to it an earlier origin than it really possessed.

An additional argument in favor of the theories advanced above is offered by another fact relating to the history of the second consulship of Sp. Cassius. According to the unanimous tradition of ancient writers, in the same year in which the first secession occurred, and in which he dedicated the temple of Ceres, Cassius concluded the *foedus aequum* with the Latins.[1] Nevertheless, as Mommsen has observed, this important event is connected neither with the preceding nor with the subsequent happenings.[2] Mommsen is led to suspect that the early annalists were silent in regard to this *foedus*, and that a later examination of the document brought about its insertion among the events of 493. It seems to me, however, that the data connected with this *foedus* are of very doubtful value, although Mommsen believes in the authenticity of the document and in the substantial accuracy of the information concerning it.

Livy, it is true, speaks in explicit terms of the *columna aenea* on which was incised the treaty of Cassius with the Latins, and Cicero declares that he saw this bronze column behind the rostra in the forum. The fact is, however, that neither Cicero nor the source of Livy saw the original document. During the six months in which, after the taking of the city, the forum remained in the possession of the Gauls, the treaty in question, together with the other public

a proleptic duplication of a law of the second century B. C. The objections of such writers as Burger (*op. cit.*, p. 187) have little weight.

[1] Cic. *Pro Balb.* 53; Liv. ii. 33. 4; Dion. Hal. vi. 95.

[2] Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch.*, II, p. 159.

documents which were incised upon a material as precious as bronze was at that period, must have disappeared.[1] What Cicero saw was a later copy. The bronze column preserved in the temple of Diana on the Aventine was likewise a copy, and not the original (as Mommsen himself admits). This was still in existence at the time of Dionysius of Halicarnassus who tells us that on it was cut the treaty between the Latins and King Servius Tullius.[2] The doubtful historical personality of this king naturally leads one to suspect that his name was inscribed on the column only in a late copy, which was seen by Dionysius and Varro.

Similar doubts may be formed in regard to the treaty of Cassius, since the very existence of this consul is by no means certain. According to one tradition, for example, instead of a patrician and consul, he is said to have been a plebeian and a tribune of the people. The names of the eponymous magistrates are lacking in the international treaties of the Greek republics of the sixth century, and seem at times to be lacking even at the end of the fifth century.[3] But even if in the fifth century the names of the contracting parties were ordinarily signed to the Greek treaties, it is hardly possible that as early as 493 B. C. the Roman state was far enough advanced to follow this rule closely. The reasonableness of this conclusion is shown by the famous question concerning the date of the first treaty between Carthage and Rome. Polybius,[4] as is well known,

[1] Schwegler, *Röm. Geschichte*, I, pp. 19 ff. This document certainly met the same fate as did the Twelve Tables, which too were incised on tables or columns of bronze and placed in front of the rostra. See Diod. xii. 26. 1; Dion. Hal. x. 57; cf. Liv. vi. 1. 9.

[2] Dion. Hal. iv. 26; cf. Mommsen, *Röm. Gesch.*, I[6], p. 216; and my *Ancient Legends, etc.* (New York, 1905), pp. 128. ff

[3] See the early decree from Elis (Röhl, *Inscr. gr. ant.*, no. 110); the laws of the colonies of Naupactus of the fifth century (*ibid.*, no. 321) and the treaties mentioned by Thucydides v. 47 (421 B. C), 77 (418 B. C.), 79 (418 B. C.). For the opposite see Thuc. v. 19, 24 (422 B. C.); *CIA*, I, no. 8. It is worthy of note that the above-mentioned decree from Elis, the oldest Greek international treaty, already shows the possibility of text-corruption. Such corruption is attested by Roman tradition for the *senatus consulta* anterior to the laws of Valerius and Horatius: Liv. iii. 55. 14: "senatus consulta in aedem Cereris ad aediles plebis deferrentur quae ante arbitrio consulum supprimebantur vitiabanturque."

[4] Polyb. iii. 22.

assigns this treaty to the first year of the Republic, and says it was made in the year of the consulship of Junius Brutus and M. Horatius. The Roman annalists, on the other hand, do not speak of a treaty between the two states before 348, which is the date accepted by Mommsen. In this Mommsen seems to me to be perfectly correct, although his theory is rejected by many critics. However, even some of those who oppose him recognize that the names of the consuls mentioned by Polybius are contrary to the order and chronology accepted in the various traditions and in the *fasti*, and that these names did not exist in the document which was transcribed and interpreted by Polybius. I agree with the many critics who hold that Polybius added on his own account the names of consuls who were not colleagues.[1]

But even if we admit that in the original of the *foedus Cassianum*, and not alone in the copy seen by Cicero, the name of Cassius appeared, and that he was consul in 491 and not tribune after 457, the dates of 520, 493, and 486 for his three consulships are not sufficiently guaranteed. Livy, himself notes that the names and chronological series of the magistrates of the first century of the Republic were different in the various annals.[2] There is no reason for attaching importance to the fact that these three consulships appear in the *Fasti consolari*. To those who make a careful study of Roman history it is now well known that even when accompanied by ancient documents, and especially for the earliest periods, these *fasti* were compiled at a rather late period, and take into account the narrations of even the more recent annalists.

[1] Mommsen, *Röm. Chronologie*, 2d ed., pp. 320 ff.

[2] Liv. ii. 8. 5, 18. 4, 21. 3 f. (499–95 B. C.): "tanti errores implicant temporum aliter apud alios ordinatis magistratibus, ut nec qui consules secundum quosdam, nec quid quoque anno actum sit in tanta vetustate non rerum modo sed etiam auctorum digerere possis;" 33. 2; iii. 23. 7 (cf., however, *Fasti triumph.* for 459 B. C.); iv. 7. 2, 10. 8; cf. with 22. 7; 16. 4, 20. 5 f., 23. 2: eosdem consules insequenti anno refectos Iulium tertium Verginium iterum apud Licinium Macrum invenio, Valerius Antias et Q. Tubero M. Manlium et Q. Sulpicium consules in eum annum edunt . . . . sed inter cetera vetustate comperta hoc quoque in incerto positum" (434 B. C.); 46. 11. Moreover, uncertainties and errors of this nature also occur in the following century; see Liv. vii. 42 (342 B. C.); viii. 40 (322 B. C.).

One is strengthened in the belief that the year fixed for this treaty is not authentic (493 B. C.; 491 according to Dionysius; possibly 487 according to Fabius) by the fact that in the same year Gelo succeeded Hippocrates of Gela, and inaugurated the rule of the Deinomenids, who brought the greater portion of Sicily under either the direct dominion or the hegemony of Syracuse.[1] According to this, the recognition of the hegemony of Rome over Latium would have occurred at the same time as that of the Deinomenids over Sicily. But both Sp. Cassius and the Deinomenid Gelo were closely connected with the cult of Ceres, and the Roman consul was even author of a proposition relating to the distribution of Sicilian grain. This leads us to suspect that this synchronism is as false as the two just examined, and deliberately invented in order to bring the history of Rome into relation with that of Syracuse. In the same way and for the same reasons the expulsion of the Tarquins from Rome was made to coincide with the driving-out of the sons of Pisistratus from Athens (509 B. C.).

If, as Mommsen has already suspected, the accounts concerning the pretended agrarian laws and the intentions of Sp. Cassius with reference to Sicilian grain are false, we are naturally led to doubt the statements concerning the second consulship of Cassius and the date assigned to the treaty with the Latins. Mommsen has shown that the deeds of Coriolanus are also legendary, and it is worthy of note that the name of Coriolanus is associated with that of Sp. Cassius and with the importation of Sicilian grain. In the same year in which Sp. Cassius is said to have made the treaty, Coriolanus is said to have taken Corioli, and to have opposed the distribution of the Sicilian grain which later Sp. Cassius wished to introduce. We see in this a complex of events which are closely connected, and thereby intended to receive mutual support. They have, however, no serious historical value, and it is only necessary to disprove one to show the falsity of the rest.[2]

[1] According to the chronological system of Soltau (*Röm. Chronol.*, p. xxi), the treaty of Cassius was made in 491; according to Matzat (*Röm. Chronol.*, II, 12), in 486 B. C.

[2] See among others, Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch.*, II, p. 136, for the fact that the legend of Coriolanus does not belong chronologically to the time of Sp. Cassius.

The importation of Sicilian grain into Rome had the effect, not only of introducing the cult of Ceres and the Greek legends connected with this cult, but also, if I am not mistaken, of bringing into the history of the fifth century the pretended agitation concerning the agrarian laws.

Mommsen, whose acuteness of intellect is equaled only by his immense learning, has shown that there is no historical value in the accounts which have come down to us concerning the agrarian laws of Sp. Cassius, Cn. Manlius Capitolinus, and Sp. Melius, the three well-known demagogues of the Republic who aspired at becoming tyrants; and has noted that the legend of Sp. Cassius mirrors the agrarian agitations of the time of the Gracchi, and those of Manlius and Melius the internal revolutions of the age of Sulla.[1] It seems to me that Mommsen is in the main correct, but that the first material from which these legends were constructed, and the dates assigned for the various events, were drawn from the history of Sicily.

Diodorus for the year 454 B. C. (459 of Varro) states that after the fall of the tyrants and the establishment of democratic government in the various Siceliot cities, grave public seditions arose as a result of the lists of the citizens which had to be compiled, and on account of the assignments of land. This was especially the case at Syracuse, where a certain Tyndarides, by favoring the poor and attracting clients, formed a faction which was ready to aid him in becoming tyrant. For this he was tried and condemned to death, but on his way to prison was liberated by his partisans. In the ensuing sedition the aristocratic party killed Tyndarides and many of his followers. Events of this nature, Diodorus adds, were of frequent occurrence, and gave rise to the law of petalism, which was similar to the ostracism at Athens. This new provision, however, proved detrimental to the state, and the city was agitated by frequent seditions. Petalism was applied to the better

The reason why it was connected with him, it seems to me, is that the Sicilian grain figures in both legends.

[1] Mommsen, *loc. cit.*, pp. 153 ff.; cf. my *Ancient Legends of Roman History*, pp. 204 ff.

citizens (i. e., those belonging to the aristocratic party), and as a result those who did not wish to run the risk of exile abstained from public affairs, and gave themselves up to easy and sumptuous living. The state thus came into the hands of the worst element of its citizens (πονηρότατοι), who, under the pretext of educating the youths in the forensic art, sought to make great gain for themselves. Caring little for harmony and honesty, they stirred up the plebs (τὰ πλήθη), and incited them to sedition (ταραχάς) and political change (νεωτερισμόν). To free the state from this band of demagogues and calumniators (δημαγωγῶν πλήθος καὶ συκοφάντων), in 454 B. C. the law of petalism was finally abrogated.[1]

Let us now consider the history of Rome as it has been handed down to us for the period between 466 and 454 B. C. In 466 the government of the tyrants was overthrown at Syracuse, and in 466, according to Diodorus (471 of Varro) the popular magistracy of the tribunate arose at Rome. In 454 the democratic law of petalism was abrogated at Syracuse, and in 454 (Varr.), as a result of the abuse of the tribunician power and in connection with the processes of the consuls Veturius and Romilius, an agreement was reached at Rome between the patricians and the plebs, and the commission nominated which was to prepare the material for the laws of the decemvirate. The decemvirate, finally, abolished the popular magistracy of the tribunes.[2] This strange similarity is made more striking by the fact that the calumnies of the Syracusan demagogues and the institution of petalism have their parallel in the lawsuits brought by the tribunes against the patricians, both magistrates and non-magistrates, who in the annals are continually represented as lamenting over the calumnies of the tribunes. In every respect the tribunes resemble the demagogues, or rather the προστάται, of Syracuse.[3]

[1] Diod. xi. 86. 3 ff.

[2] Liv. iii. 31. 7 (454 B. C.): "tunc abiecta lege quae promulgata consenuerat, tribuni lenius agere cum patribus: finem tandem certaminum facerent. si plebeiae leges displicerent, at illi comuniter legum latores et ex plebe et ex patribus qui utrisque utilia ferrent quaeque aequandae libertatis essent, sinerent creari." Cf. Dion. Hal. x. 51.

[3] It would take too long to quote all of the passages in which the patricians

The process of Coriolanus, which, as Mommsen recognized, is placed arbitrarily in 491, has a noteworthy parallel in that of Caeso Quinctius (461 B. C.). Neither was a responsible magistrate, and especially in the case of Coriolanus it is hard to understand how it was possible for the plebs, who had been in possession of the tribunate for barely a year, to have so quickly transformed this means of protecting their rights into such a powerful means of offense against the patricians.[1] The more recent Roman annalists sought to conceal the improbability of these narrations, either by inventing a series of non-historical particulars in regard to the offense of Caeso, or by assigning to the tribunes and plebs rights which they acquired only gradually during a long period of internal history. Especially in the case of Coriolanus, however, they failed to give their narrative a purely historical aspect and to make it correct from a juridical point of view. The pretended processes of Coriolanus and of Caeso Quinctius, of which one seems a duplication of the other, are best explained, if I am not mistaken, by supposing them to be infiltrations into the pseudo-Roman history, and to be applications of the law of petalism—a law similar to that of ostracism at Athens and which struck a blow at the citizens who were in the way of the democratic state, even though the elements for establishing political guilt were lacking. This supposition gains additional probability when we recall that as a result of

lament the calumnies of the tribunes. See, e. g., Liv. iii. 9. 2. (462 B. C.); 10. 7 (461 B.C.); 15. 2: "quantum iuniores patrum se magis insinuabant, eo acrius contra tribuni tendebant ut plebi suspecto eos criminando facerent" (460 B. C.).

[1] For the process of Coriolanus see Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch.*, I, p. 140; *Röm. Staatsr.*, II², p. 288, n. 2. Mommsen asserts that the process of Caeso Quinctius is juridically correct, inasmuch as he had offended a tribune (Liv. iii. 11 ff.). It should be noted, however, that while according to Livy (iii. 13. 1), Volscius, the principal witness in the trial of Caeso which resulted in his conviction, is said to have been "tribunus ante aliquot annos" at the time when he was offended; according to Dionysius (x. 7), on the other hand, he was a private citizen when he was offended and tribune when he appeared as witness in the trial. It is true that Livy (iii. 11. 6) says of Caeso that "hoc duce saepe pulsi foro tribuni, fusa ac fugata plebes est," but Dionysius (x. 5) does not speak of such insults to the tribunes. In short, the version of Livy aims at being juridically correct, while that of Dionysius makes no pretense at accuracy. In reality Caeso, although a private citizen, was condemned merely because he was against the plebs.

petalism the Syracusans of the aristocratic party retired from public life and abandoned the city to base demagogues, and that according to Roman tradition, L. Quinctius Cincinnatus, made consul in 460 B. C., the year following the exile of his own son Caeso, "adsiduis contionibus pro tribunali non in plebe coercenda quam senatu castigando vehementior fuit, *cuius ordinis languore* perpetui iam tribunis plebis non ut in re publica populi Romani, sed ut in perdita domo lingua criminibus regnarent." On the occasion of the exile of his son Caeso, he said: "virtutem, constantiam, omnia iuventutis belli domique decora pulsa ex urbe Romana et fugata esse; loquaces seditiosos, semina discordiarum, iterum ac tertium tribunos pessimis artibus regia licentia vivere."[1]

It would take too long to enumerate the various events connected with the discords and tumults which fill the annals of Livy and Dionysius, and which resemble closely that which is said concerning the ταραχαί at Syracuse. On the other hand, I wish to note that the episode of Tyndarides has an exact parallel in the legend of Sp. Melius, who about 439 B. C. brought much grain from Etruria and the harbors of Cumae and Miscum, and thus secured a numerous following, by the aid of which he hoped to become tyrant. Minucius discovered his plot, and the dictator Cincinnatus, through Servilius, *magister equitum*, invited him to disculpate himself. Melius sought to save himself, first by calling on the plebs for aid, and then by flight; but Servilius overtook and killed him. In the main the Syracusan event and the Roman legend agree perfectly. There is no importance attached to the fact that the killing of Tyndarides is referred to about 454 B. C., while the legend of Melius is placed by Livy in 439, since, according to the same version of Livy, it is associated with a pretended dictatorship of Cincinnatus. This dictatorship of Cincinnatus, however, is one of the many duplications of a single event and legend which are attributed to about the year 458 B. C. Moreover, the earliest Roman annalists do not bring Sp. Cassius into relation with Cincinnatus.[2] For our purpose it is sufficient to note that the two

[1] Liv. iii. 19. 4 ff.

[2] Liv. iv. 13; Cinc. Al. and Calp. Pis. apud Diod. Hal. xii, 1f. Cic. *De*

similar events are placed at about the same period, and that the picture given by the annalists of Roman life between 466 and 454 corresponds too closely in its various aspects with the real and historical life of Syracuse of that period. We are therefore justified if not in asserting, at least in suspecting, that one is a copy of the other. The only element lacking is the eloquence of Corax and Tisias, which could not be reproduced in the Roman copy. Notwithstanding all his patriotism, Cicero, the great advocate of early Roman eloquence, could find no examples of famous orators anterior to Pyrrhus, save the Valerii, who by their eloquence are said to have checked the plebs in their two secessions.[1]

We have little information concerning the internal history of Syracuse for the years subsequent to 454. From a speech which, according to Thucydides, was pronounced by Athenagoras, *προστάτης τοῦ δήμου*, about 415 B. C., we learn that, while Hermocrates was seeking to convince the Syracusans of the possibility of a war with Athens, and exhorting them to ally themselves with the neighboring cities, the popular orator declared these presages of war idle, and to have been spread merely to divert the minds of the plebs from internal questions. From the same discourse we learn that at Syracuse there was a party of aristocratic youths who aimed at attaining office before reaching the legal age, and who would not brook civic equality.[2] One seems to be reading the account of the pretended Roman history of the period, both in regard to the frequent interference of the young patricians,

senect. 16. For the dictatorship and consulships of Cincinnatus see Ihne, *Röm. Gesch.*, I, p. 140 n. 3. I am not sure it has been noticed that the episode concerning Cincinnatus and Minucius is merely a proleptic duplication of that regarding Fabius Cunctator and Minucius *magister equitum* of 217 B. C. (Liv. xxii 29). This last event is naturally historical, but even it is not free from rhetorical embellishments, as is shown by the speech of Minucius which contains a version of several lines of Hesiod, as was noted by Weissenborn among others.

[1] Cic. *Brut.* 14. 54. The annalists had fewer scruples. Both Livy (iii. 11. 6) and Dionysius (x. 5) state that Caeso was eloquent, but by their own confession his eloquence consisted in using his fists, and he was unable to quell the confusion which reigned during processes.

[2] Thuc. vi. 36 ff.; cf especially 37. 3: *ἡ πόλις ἡμῶν ὀλιγάκις μὲν ἡσυχάζει, στάσεις δὲ πολλὰς καὶ ἀγώνας οὐ πρὸς τοὺς πολεμίους πλείονας ἢ πρὸς αὐτὴν ἀναιρεῖται, τυραννίδας δὲ ἔστιν ὅτε καὶ δυναστείας ἀδίκους.*

such as Coriolanus and Caeso,[1] and in regard to the intercessions of the tribunes, who are said to have prevented the consuls from forming an army, on the pretext that there was no danger of incurring the war which the consuls predicted.[2]

With the exception of those, especially among my countrymen, who on account of preconceived and erroneous patriotic opinions are unable to discriminate between truth and falsehood, modern critics are almost unanimous in declaring Roman history up to

[1] See Liv. iii. 14, 15. 2, 65 5.

[2] See Liv. iii. 10. 11 (461 B. C.): "libertatem populi Romani . . . . arte eludi, quia occidione prope occisos Volscos et Aequos movere sua sponte arma posse iam fides abierit, novos hostes quaeri; coloniam fidam propinquam infamem fieri, bellum innoxiis Antiatibus indici;" 16. 5 (460 B. C.): "tantus enim tribunos furor tenuit ut non bellum, sed vanam imaginem belli ad advertendos ab legis cura plebis animos Capitolium insedisse contenderent;" and 24. 1 (459 B. C.): "clamant [the tribunes] fraude fieri, quod foris teneatur exercitus; frustationem eam legis tollendae esse." Cf. iv. 53 (410 B. C.).

Even in regard to external history the deeds of the Syracusans resemble somewhat those related of Rome. Cloelius Gracchus, the leader of the Aequi, was a man of great energy and had attained an almost regal position among his people. He caused much annoyance to Tusculum, the ally of Rome, and in 458 B. C. (Varr.) he surrounded the army of the consul Minucius, who, together with his men, was freed by the legendary dictator Quintius Cincinnatus (Liv. iii. 25; Dion. Hal. x. 22 ff.). This account resembles somewhat that of Ducetius, the leader of the Siculi, who, having attained almost regal authority over his people between 459 and 451, gave much trouble to Syracuse and her ally Agrigentum. The general Bolcon, whom he overcame, was punished with death by the Syracusans (see Diod. xi. 78, 88. 6, 91 ff.). It is true that Bolcon was killed, while the Roman general went uninjured; but it must be remembered that the episode of Minucius follows the story of the later and historical Minucius of 217 B. C.—a time when conquered Roman generals were no longer punished nor put to death (thus in 216 the senate went out to meet the defeated Varro to thank him for not having lost hope for the Republic—Liv. xxii. 61. 14). The dramatic episode of the defeated Ducetius prostrating himself before the altars of the gods, and placing himself and his people under the control of Syracuse, recalls vividly the story of Themistocles, who before going to Asia came as a suppliant to the domestic hearth of Admetus (Plut. *Them.* 24); and this scene in turn (Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch.*, II, p. 118) brings to mind the occasion when Coriolanus presented himself to Attius Tullius, the Volscian leader. I shall treat elsewhere of the influence of the history of Greece proper upon that of the Greeks of Sicily. Be it merely noted here that, according to Stesimbrotus of Thasos (apud Plin., *loc. cit.*), before going to Asia, Themistocles is said to have visited Hiero of Syracuse. Thucydides knew nothing of this, and the origin of the story is uncertain.

the fourth century at least false and legendary.[1] Livy himself, much more than many modern critics, was convinced of the slight historical value of the narratives up to the time of the capture of the city by the Gauls.[2] Possibly his famous statement concerning the loss of the earliest monuments pertaining to Roman history, which perished during the Gallic invasion, contains an *excusatio non petita* on the part of the annalists from whom he drew, who were glad of an opportunity to escape furnishing proofs for so many gratuitous assertions.

The fact is that the early annalists, no less than those of a later period, know how to falsify. Just as for the Greeks after Herodotus and Antiochus, so at least for the first of these annalists history was a political product, even though it had originated and developed under the influence of Greek history when this had

[1] The falsity of the Roman accounts of the agrarian agitations of the fifth century is recognized by Poehlmann, *Gesch. d. antiken Communismus* (Munich, 1901), II, p. 474.

[2] Liv. *Praef.* 6, vi. 1, viii. 40; cf. Polyb. vi. 3. 3. It is to be deplored that these fairly explicit passages have not received from Italian critics the attention they deserve. The last few years have witnessed the appearance of Roman histories and articles on Roman history, in which are accepted as true not only the events referred to the fifth century B. C., but even those connected with the regal period.

As a matter of curiosity, it may be noted here that the legend of Lucretia, which is mirrored in that of Virginia, has an authentic parallel in the history of Syracuse. The wife of Dionysius I, having been violated by the Syracusans during an uprising, freed herself from dishonor by a voluntary death (see Plut. *Dio.* 3). Moreover, it was noted even by Aristotle (*Pol.* v. 3, p. 1303 Bk.) that revolutions were frequently caused by love-intrigues. For similar reasons occurred the driving-out of the sons of Pisistratus, reported by a false synchronism as contemporary with that of the Tarquins, and also the coming of the Gauls to Chiusi (see Liv. v. 33).

Still another parallel may be drawn from the case of Valerius Publicola, who freed the land from the yoke of Porsenna. Being without a colleague, he exercised his power somewhat as a στρατηγὸς αὐτοκράτωρ, granted the people the right to choose another consul, destroyed his own house, was well disposed toward the plebs, separated the axes from the *fasces*, and rendered the consular power less terrible by the law *de provacatione*. This closely resembles the case of Gelo, who freed the country from the Carthaginians, pretended to wish to abandon his power, and, like Publicola, acquired fame as a humanitarian and friend of the people. Even if we make allowance for the many exaggerations with which the character of Gelo has been adorned, there is still much truth in that which is narrated concerning him. Is Publicola likewise a historical character?

become an *opus oratorium* rather than a literary practice. Even before the introduction of historical falsehoods for artistic reasons, they were used to strengthen the pretensions of the state, and were, to use a phrase of Livy, a *salubre mendacium.* Thus Fabius, a Roman senator and the first historian of his country in point of time, acted like a good patriot when he borrowed from neighboring peoples the events and glorious deeds which he inserted into the history of his own country, just as much as when he went to Delphi to consult the oracle after the defeat at Cannae.

But just as there is no falsehood which does not presuppose some real fact which it has more or less hidden and distorted, so the Roman annalists, in creating a history which they did not possess, did not manufacture the events out of whole cloth. The lack of originality of the human mind would not lead us to expect this at any period, and especially not from the Romans, who had much less ability in that direction than the Greeks. They therefore frequently borrowed from the history of neighboring peoples, localizing and adapting the facts to suit their own conditions.[1] It is a well-known fact that in the same way many stories and legends of Greece proper had been localized and adopted by the various Greek colonies, and that the Romans followed their example is obvious, as may be seen from the preceding pages. Such borrowing, moreover, did not occur in the case of political history alone, but also in literature and art. From Greek poetry that of the Latins borrowed not only its inspiration, but also its substance, characters, situations, similes, metres, and at times even phrases. Every student of classical philology has noted how much in each of these respects Catullus, Vergil, and Horace owe to the poets of Greece, even when they appear to have other events in mind. The same is true in the case of the fine arts. It will suffice to recall that the Tuscan order is merely an awkward imitation of the Doric, and that the Etruscan urns and coins imitate well-known Greek types.

It will be of aid for our purpose to apply to the peoples of central Italy that natural psychological procedure according to which

[1] See the first chapter of my *Storia di Roma.*

the history of one country is taken as a model for that of another. The famous tomb discovered by François in 1847 near the banks of the Fiora, in the territory of Vulci, shows that the history of the Tarquinii, of Caelius Vibenna, and of Masterna or Servius Tullius, was conceived in exactly the same manner as that of Achilles, the avenger of the death of Patroclus, and as that of Eteocles and Polynices.[1] The events of the Greek legend are depicted in parallel groups which correspond entirely with the events of the Etrusco-Roman history or pseudo-history. Thus it is evident that from the third century, before which period the pictures must date, as a result of Greek commerce and politics the Etruscans were accustomed to represent their history in a manner analogous to that of Greece. We have a later trace of this psychological process in certain traditions relating to the legend of Coriolanus. As ancient writers have noted, his story, especially in regard to his death, was deliberately falsified in order to obtain a perfect parallel with the story of Themistocles, with whom Coriolanus was held to correspond.[2]

Among the places which in this manner exercised great influence upon the writing of Roman history, Sicily and Syracuse were the foremost, especially after the battles of the Himera (480 B. C.) and of Cumae (474 B. C.). This condition lasted till 357, when, with the overthrow of the tyranny of the second Dionysius, Syracuse commenced to decline and pale before the transient splendor of Tarentum as ruled by Archytas, or even till 289, when with Agathocles the last of her glory came to an end. During this entire period Syracuse was the most powerful of the Greek cities of the West. Her ships controlled the Mediterranean, and Dionysius and Agathocles were among the most powerful princes of their time. The history of the famous city even after 289 was

[1] See *Annali d. Inst.*, 1859, pp. 325 ff., Plate M; cf. Gardthausen, *Mastarna oder Servius Tullius* (Leipzig, 1882), who, in an otherwise excellent article, wrongly attributes historical value to the paintings of myths merely because they represent the opinions of the *auctores Tusci* instead of those of the Roman annalists, although their authority is not superior to that of common tradition.

[2] Cic. *Brut.* 41 f.: "consessum est rhetoribus ementiri in historiis;" cf. Mommsen, *Röm. Forsch.*, pp. 115, 118, 146.

written by such an able and famous historian as Timaeus. Her deeds were on the lips of everyone; and to a certain extent might be said of Syracuse in regard to the West what Pericles said of Athens, viz., that she was the mistress of Greece, and that her laws served as examples for other states.[1]

Unfortunately our knowledge of the early history of the Siceliot cities is very fragmentary. That we know something more of Syracuse at the time of Gelo, Hermocrates, Dionysius I, and Hannibal is due to the intervention and wars of Carthage, Athens, and Rome. Had fate preserved the histories of Philistus and Timaeus, or even those of Callias and Silenus, we should doubtless have been in a position to establish the origin of the greater portion of the pseudo-history of Rome of the fifth century—a pseudo-history contrasting vividly with the scarcity of references for a large portion of the true history of Rome for the two succeeding centuries. If I am not mistaken, however, even in its fragmentary state enough of Siceliot history has come down to warrant us in asserting that this pseudo-history is in part a duplication and localization of the history of Sicily.

We cannot now ascertain how much of this pretended history had become localized at Rome at a very early period by means of the cults, how much was invented by Greek writers such as Timaeus and Silenus, and how much, finally, owes its origin to analogies in the history of the two countries which were noted by the early annalists, such as Fabius Pictor and Cincius. It seems permissible to assert, however, that this, in general, is what happened; and, unless we are mistaken in this particular instance, it seems certain that the cult of Ceres, and the tribunate of the plebs connected with it, came from Syracuse, and that this fact furnished a handle for the parallel chronological development of the two institutions. The cult of Ceres, moreover, does not seem to have been the only one which came from Sicily. To it should possibly be added that of Mercury. Certainly, at a later period the Romans imported from the island the cult of Venus Erycina; and possibly the very doctrine of the *Indigitamenta* had its origin from the same source

[1] Thuc. ii. 37, 40.

from which sprang the doctrines set forth by Empedocles of Agrigentum.[1] In an excellent article, Beloch[2] has noted many points of contact between the political institutions of Dionysius and those of Rome; such, for example, as the military colonies and the confederate states. Whether or not these resemblances are accidental we cannot at present determine. At any rate, just as at the time of Dionysius, so during the ensuing period down to Agathocles and Hiero II, Syracuse stood in close relations with Latium;[3] and on that account we are not surprised to find other points of contact in the history of the two countries for the period after the fifth century.

The complete subjugation of the Latins and the admission of Campania on the part of Rome fell, according to Diodorus, in the same year in which occurred the death of Timoleon (337 B. C.)[4] —a man who had devoted all his energies to freeing a part of Sicily from the domination of Carthage, and who three years before had made an alliance with the Romans.[5] We have here another synchronism, and one which occurred at a period which for all three peoples is perfectly historical, and is therefore, in substance at least, authentic. From the fifth century on, Syracuse had important and continuous relations with the maritime regions of central Italy, and in addition often drew upon Campania for mer-

[1] For the statue of Empedocles brought from Agrigentum and set up before the Curia at Rome, see Diog. Laert. viii. 2. 73.

[2] Beloch, *op. cit.*, pp. 12 ff.

[3] Two treaties between Carthage and Rome are cited by Polybius (iii. 24, 25). The second of these, at any rate, falls in the fourth century ,and speaks of Roman navigation about Sicily. Moreover, Postumius, called the Tyrrhenian, in 339 B. C. entered as a friend the port of Syracuse with a fleet of twelve ships, but was killed by Timoleon for pirating (Diod. xvi. 82. 3). Varro (*D. R. R.* ii. 10. 11) states that in 300 B. C. barbers came for the first time from Sicily to Ardea. It is curious to note that the Romans, in this case wrongly, thought they owed to Sicily one of their fundamental domestic and political institutions—i. e., that of the patrons, which is in reality common to both Aryan and non-Aryan races. The eponymous Πάτρων of patrons who came to Latium with Evander (Plut. *Rom.* 13, 14) is, I think, the same as the Πάτρων of Aluntius, the companion of Aeneas (see Dion. Hal. i. 51).

[4] Diod. xvi. 90. 2=340 B. C. according to Liv. viii. 10 ff.

[5] Diod. xvi. 69=348 B. C. according to Liv. vii. 27. 2.

cenaries in her wars against Carthage. She must naturally, therefore, have been on her guard against this new and extraordinary increase in the power of Rome. As has been noted by Niese, among others, Duris, the historian of Agathocles, spoke of the victory of 295 B. C. at Sentinum.[1] It should be added, however, that the Romans were not indifferent to the relations which existed between Agathocles and the Etruscans, Samnites, Iapygians, and Peucetians.[2] In the same year in which Agathocles tried to regain for Syracuse the maritime hegemony which had been lost in consequence of the civil wars succeeding the death of Timoleon, the Romans, by the foundation of the maritime colonies of Suessa

[1] Dur. apud Diod. xxi. 6. For Callias and his mention of Rome, see above, p. 238, note 1.

[2] For the fleet of eighteen ships sent by the Τυρρηνοί to Syracuse, see Diod. xx. 61. These Tyrrhenians were hardly the inhabitants of Caere who in 353 B. C. had been deprived of half of their territory by the Romans (see Dio. Cass., fr. 30, ed. Melber; cf. Liv. vii. 20. 8), and still less the inhabitants of Antium who after 338 B. C. had become Roman subjects (Liv. viii. 15. 8). It is true that even after this time the Antians continued their piratical practices (Strab. v, p. 232 C.), but in this case aid on the part of the state is evidently meant, and this could not come from the Antians, whose warships had been destroyed. On the other hand, we know that between 312 and 294 the Romans were continually at war with the Etruscans (Liv. ix. 29 ff.; x. 5. 10), the friends of Agathocles in 310 (Diod. xxi. 3). At that time Rome was friendly to Carthage, with whom in 306 (Liv. ix. 43) she had made a second or third treaty. This alliance was sincere, since both had common interests of expansion, the one in Sicily, the other in Italy, to the detriment of the preponderance of Syracuse. In 306, however (Diod. xx. 79), Agathocles made peace with the Carthaginians, renounced his claims on the Punic territory of Sicily, and attempted, as had Dionysius before him, the conquest of Bruttium. Had he lived longer, and succeeded in his undertaking, he would of necessity have come into conflict with the Romans, as did Alexander of Epirus a few decades later. On the other hand, since Diodorus (xxi. 3) mentions the Tyrrhenian allies of Agathocles in connection with the Ligurians and Celts, it seems more natural to suppose that they, together with the Etruscan ships, came from some Etruscan city not far from Liguria. This might have been Volaterrae (Liv. x. 12), or still more probably Pisa. The maritime importance of Pisa has been brought out, if not by Timaeus (Geffcken, *op. cit.*, pp. 44, 148), at least by writers who flourished shortly after the period in question (see Lycophr., vss. 1355 ff.). For the Samnites see Diod. xx. 11; for the Peucetians and Iapygians, *ibid.* xxi. 4. Such questions as the above were overlooked by Schubert in his *Geschichte des Agathokles* (Breslau, 1887). It is curious to note that, according to Lydus (*De mens.* i. 19; cf. *De mag.* i. 22), the Roman *trabea* was derived from Agathocles.

and Pontia in 312 B. C.,[1] by the creation of the *duoviri navales* (311 B. C.),[2] and by their naval operations along the southern shores of Campania (310 B. C.),[3] guarded themselves against the Samnite allies of Agathocles, who at this period (310 B. C.) in his expedition against Carthage took with him mercenaries hired from the Samnites. Agathocles had to keep close watch on the progress of Rome as well as of Tarentum. This latter city more or less openly aided the Samnites in their operations against Rome, and tried to prevent the Romans from conquering Naples and Luceria.[4] The old and perennial state of hostility between Agathocles and Tarentum was certainly one of the causes which led to the defeat of the Samnites between 320 and 290 B. C., and which enabled the Romans to found their colonies of Luceria (314 B. C.) and Venusia (291 B. C.). Moreover, we know that in the last years of his adventurous life Agathocles seized Corcyra, made alliances in Epirus, and in general followed the Adriatic policy of Dionysius I, including, among other things, the forming of a league with the inhabitants of the Apulian coast. On this account it does not seem accidental that in the very year in which the death of the dread Syracusan tyrant occurred, the Romans should have secured a foothold on the Adriatic and have founded there the colonies of Castrum Novum, Sena Gallica, and Adria (289 B. C.).

It seems to me that this and the preceding synchronisms have hitherto been overlooked. The relations, now friendly, now hostile, between Syracuse, Latium, and Campania were probably much more important than would appear from the scanty tradition which has come down to us, for which reason we seem justified in holding that the legislation and political system of Syracuse exercised influence on Rome in the fourth century as well, in the same way and for the same reasons that Rome later learned from Alexandria certain measures pertaining to city administration. Thus, in modern times, the English constitution introduced in the seventeenth century served (and still serves in part) as a model, first for

[1] Diod. xix. 101=313 B. C., Liv. ix. 28.

[2] Liv. ix. 30. 4.

[3] Liv. ix. 38.

[4] Liv. viii. 25, 27 (cf. Dion. Hal. xv. 5. 10), 29; ix. 14; Diod. xx. 104.

France, and later for a large portion of the civilized nations of Europe. That Rome after the middle of the fourth century was called a πόλις Ἑλληνίς is due not only to the fact that Greek navigators were hospitably welcomed at Ostia and Rome, but also to the facility with which the future mistress of the world adopted outside institutions.[1] This is proved by the coins of Greek types which Rome commenced to strike about that period,[2] and also by the censorship of Appius Claudius Caecus, the at once kindly, cultivated, and terrible Roman, in whom, as we shall see, it is not difficult to recognize an imitator of such statesmen as Dionysius I and Archytas.

In regard to the narration of the deeds of the Romans, the Siceliot historians could not have been less active in the fourth century, when they wrote of the Greek cities on the Campanian confines, than in the following century, when Campania belonged to Rome. A rather striking example of this seems to me to be offered by the story of the taking of Rome by the Gauls. From Polybius, the chief source for this event, we learn that Rome owed her safety to the Veneti who invaded the territory of the Gauls.[3] Both Livy and Diodorus, moreover, state that after capturing Rome the Gauls pressed as far as Apulia.[4] Certainly the memory of this could not have been preserved in the *Annales Maximi*,

[1] Heraclides Ponticus, a contemporary of Plato and Aristotle in speaking (apud Plut. *Cam.* 22) of Rome when captured by the Gauls, calls it a πόλιν Ἑλληνίδα. This was said, not by a merchant, but by a philosopher in a discourse περὶ ψυχῆς.

[2] I accept, in the main, the data concerning the origin of Roman coinage of Samwer, "Geschichte des älteren römischen Münzwesen," *Numismatische Zeitschrift*, Vienna, 1883. He is followed by Milani, "Aes rude, signatum e grave," *Rivista italiana di numismatica*, pp. 18 ff. The Pegasus which figures on the bronze quadrilaterals assigned by Milani to the second half of the fourth and the beginning of the third century, is, I believe, a type derived from Syracusan coins, just as in the middle of the fourth century the figure of Pegasus on the coins of Regium, Terina, and Locri was derived from Syracuse. See Imhoof-Blumer, "Die Münzen Akarnaniens," *Numismatische Zeitschrift*, Vienna, X (1883), p. 6. For the *aes grave* with Sicilian types see below, p. 294, note 1.

[3] Polyb. ii. 18. 3.

[4] Diodorus (xi. 96; 387 B. C.) speaks of the invasion of Apulia by the Gauls in connection with the taking of the city. Livy (vi. 42. 8; vii. 1. 3, 26. 9; 349 B. C.) refers to it in connection with the wars fought by the Gauls in 368 B. C.

which dealt merely with facts relating to the city, nor in the oral tradition of the people, since the accounts refer to distant countries with which Rome did not come into contact till several generations later.[1]

We know, on the other hand, that the capture of Rome by the Gauls is spoken of by Greek historians, such as Aristotle and Theopompus. The memory of the facts involved had of course been preserved by Greeks, and very probably, we may add, by Siceliots. In the years immediately following the taking of Rome (i. e., between 385 and 384 B. C.) Dionysius I not only laid the foundation for a colonial empire on the Adriatic, where he made allies of certain Epirote leaders, and where he founded Pharus and Lissus, but he also, ably profiting by the loss which the Gallic invasion had inflicted on the Etruscans on both sides of the Apennines, plundered the harbor of Caere and pushed on with his ships to Corsica, the shores of which were then in the power of the Etruscans, especially those from Caere.[2] He also founded Syracusan colonies on the coast of Picenum and Venetia, at Ancona, and at Adria, where he reared his famous horses, and whither he

[1] Cf. Liv. viii. 25 (326 B. C.): "Lucani atque Apuli, quibus gentibus nihil ad eam diem cum populo Romano fuerat, in fidem venerunt." This would be still truer of the Veneti, with whom the Romans could not have had any direct and constant political relations before the beginning of the ensuing century.

[2] Diod. xv. 13 ff.; Strab. v, p. 241 C.; see above, p. 268. This important subject has never received the attention it deserves. To give a single example, no attention has been paid to the statement of Arist. (*Pol.* i. 4. 7, p. 12559 Bk.), to the effect that a certain Sicilian at the time of Dionysius bought up all the iron ἐκ τῶν σιδηρείων and sold it to the merchants who came from the various markets, so as to gain the modest amount of 100 talents for every 50 spent. Dionysius allowed him to keep the money, but expelled him from Sicily. At the time of Aristotle the ratio of silver to iron was as 1 to 2,000 (see Busolt, *Griech. Gesch.*, I, p. 202), which shows that an enormous amount of iron had been brought to Syracuse. Since, however, at that period Elba was the only place in the West possessing such rich iron mines, we are led to the probable induction that when, in 384 B. C., Dionysius made the expedition against Caere and its subject Corsica he held Elba for some length of time, just as the Admiral Apelles had done when he brought Elba under the control of Syracuse in 453 B. C. (Diod. xi. 88. 5). Probably also the revolt of Sardinia against Carthage in 379–378 (Diod. xv. 24) is to be connected with this expedition, and with the war against Carthage which was recommenced by Dionysius in 383 B. C.

relegated Philistus, his former counselor, who in that region wrote at least a portion of his histories.[1] In the same manner, we know that about 358 B. C., the time when the Gauls infested Apulia, Dionysius II founded there two colonies.[2] The historians of Syracuse more than of any other city had occasion to record these various events. This is shown by a statement of Trogus Pompeius,[3] who says that while Dionysius was waging war on Regium, the Gauls, who had shortly before burned Rome, sent envoys to

[1] See Holm, *Gesch. Siciliens*, II, pp. 440 ff., for the references in ancient writers to the Adriatic colonization of Dionysius I. For Philistus and his writing at Adria, in addition to Plutarch (*Dion.* 11), cf. Pausanias (i. 13. 9), from whom we learn that he wrote the portion of his history referring to Dionysius (cf. Dion. Hal. *Ep. ad Pomp.* 5; Cic. *Ad Q. Fratr.* ii. 11. 4); cf. also Theopompus, frr. 140 ff.).

It should be noted in this connection that the *aes grave* found between Perugia and Todi, with the triquetra on one side and a trident on the other (see Garrucci, *Le monete d. It. ant.*, Plate LIV, Fig. 7), is explained by the fact that Sicily was wrongly identified with the Θρινακρία of Homer. It was said that Sicily was thus named (i. e., Thrinakria) ἢ ὅτι τρεῖς ἄκρας ἔχει ἢ ὅτι θρίνακί ἐστιν ὁμοία (Steph. Byz., s. v.). Garrucci thinks (*op. cit.*, p. 29) that the *aes grave* is from Ancona (cf. also the coins with triskeles in Garrucci, Plate XLV, Fig. 4). Thus the Dionysus which figures on the *aes grave* of Atria Picena (Garrucci, Plate LX, Fig. 6; Plate LXI, Fig. 1; note the Pegasus of Fig. 2) is of Syracusan origin. Even today the upper valley of the Vomano above Atria at the base of the Gran Sasso d' Italia (the Mons Fiscellus) is called *Val Siciliana*, although we are in doubt as to whether the name is of ancient origin. Certainly the name of the region above Tivoli, termed "Sicilian," is ancient, and possibly also the name *Goirano dei Siculi* on the confines of the Paeligni and Marsi. All of these names recall the words of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (ii) where he says that the presence of the aboriginal Siculi (we should call it Siceliot influence) was attested in various parts of Italy by localities termed Σικελικά. These localities, however, probably derived their names at a period anterior to the fifth century, after the great commercial and political expansion of the Siceliots. The influence of the *aes grave* of Atria Picena is shown on the *aes grave* of the Umbrian Tuder (Garrucci, Plate LV, Fig, 2; Plate LVI, Figs. 3, 4). When Pliny (*N. H.* iii. 56), following more or less closely ancient sources, says that the Siculi were the earliest inhabitants of Latium, and repeats the same thing in regard to Picenum and Umbria (iii ff.), it is clear that we have to deal, not with two distinct traditions relating to indigenous peoples and to late Siceliot colonies, as has been asserted, but with two traditions arising from an analogous cause. The Siceliots of Ancona are responsible for the indigenous Siculi of Picenum.

[2] Diod. xvi. 5. 3; 10. 2.

[3] Iust. xx. 5. 4; vi. 6; Freeman, *Hist. Sic.*, IV, p. 219.

Dionysius with offers of friendship and alliance, which the tyrant gladly accepted. He might employ them either in the van of his armies or against the rear of his enemies. With the Gauls as allies the war was carried on as if just commenced. To inquire into the direct source of Trogus Pompeius, and to discover whether he depended on Timagenes or on Theopompus, has for the moment little interest for us. It is more important to note that the synchronism between the siege of Regium by Dionysius and the taking of Rome by the Gauls is probably derived from some Siceliot historian, just as was the other between the year of the death of Timoleon and that of the annexation of Campania by the Romans. Both this synchronism and also the use made by Dionysius of Gallic mercenaries are found in Diodorus,[1] a Sicilian writer whose source for the history of his country, as everyone knows, was mainly Timaeus. The chief source of Timaeus, even though he himself denies it, and also of Theopompus for the history of Dionysius, was certainly Philistus.[2] In none of the fragments of Philistus, it is true, is there any mention of Rome. Nevertheless, since in the books before the one in which he commenced to speak of Dionysius, Philistus treated of the Samnites and Tyrrhenians,[3] and discussed the deeds of his leader which had to do with the peoples of central Italy, it is clear that he could not have been silent concerning Rome. Antiochus, his predecessor, had already written of Rome, and it was from him that Philistus derived and developed the theory regarding the coming of the Siculi from Latium.[4]

The synchronism between the siege of Regium by Dionysius

[1] Diod. xiv. 113: *καθ' ὃν δὲ καιρὸν μάλιστα Ῥήγιον ἐπολιόρκει Διονύσιος, οἱ κατοικοῦντες τὰ πέραν τῶν Ἄλπεων Κελτοί.* Cf. xv. 1 C.; Polyb. vi C. Holzapfel (*Röm. Chronologie*, p. 111) thinks that this synchronism is derived from Timaeus. For the Gallic mercenaries see Diod. xv. 70.

[2] Fl. Ios. *C. Apion.* 3.

[3] See Philist., frr. 39 ff., Müller.

[4] Since Philistus (apud Dion. Hal. i. 22) says that the Siculi were Ligurians who had been driven out by the Umbrians and Pelasgians, he is evidently the author of the theory, accepted by the Romans, that the earliest inhabitants of Latium were Ligurian Siculi (see Fest., s. v. *Sacrani*, p. 321 M.). The mention of the Umbrians is noteworthy as coming from such near neighbors. Their Pelasgians, finally, were the Etruscans or Tyrrhenians of Hellanicus (see Dion. Hal. i. 28).

and the taking of Rome by the Gauls shows the way in which the source of the others that we have mentioned must be sought. To this same source, it seems to me, may be traced all of the few facts extraneous to the history of Rome which are preserved in the first ten books of Livy. The fact is that such synchronisms refer *exclusively to the history of Campania, Magna Graecia, and Sicily.*[1]

[1] Thus we have in Livy mention of the early power of the Etruscans and of the origin of the Gauls (v. 33. 3); of the introduction of scenic games from Etruria and then from Campania (vii. 2); of the pseudo-embassy of 491 to Sicily and of the embassy of 432 (iv. 25. 4, 41. 1; iv. 52. 6). In addition to these, the following synchronisms may be noted:

I. Liv. iv. 25 (433 B. C.): the demand for Sicilian grain.

II. Liv. iv. 29. 8 (431 B. C.): the first Carthaginian (Athenian ?=427 B. C.) invasion into Sicily.

III. Liv. iv. 37. 1 (424 B. C.): the taking of Capua by the Samnites=Diod. xii. 31 (438 B. C.).

IV. Liv. iv. 44. 12 (420 B. C.): the taking of Cumae=Diod. xii. 76 (421 B. C.).

V. Liv. v. 28. 2 (394 B. C.): the capture by the Liparian pirates of the tripod which the Romans were sending to Delphi=Diod. xiv. 93 (393 B. C.).

VI. Liv. vi. 42. 8; vii. 1. 3, 26. 10 (368, 366, 349 B. C.): the invasion of Apulia by the Gauls.

VII. Liv. vii. 25. 4 ff. (349–348 B. C.): the Greek fleet (which Livy believed to be Sicilian) off the coast of Latium; see below, pp. 345 ff.

VIII. Liv. viii. 3. 7, 24; ix. 17 (341–327 B. C.): the undertakings of Alexander of Epirus in Magna Graecia, and his death. (As we know, Livy also gives the date of the founding of Alexandria, and, as in the case of the Egyptian Alexandria, is several years out of the way—c. 335–332 B. C.)

IX. Liv. x. 2 (303–302 B. C.=Diod. xx. 103 ff., 303 B. C.): the undertakings of Cleonymus, the enemy of Agathocles, in Apulia and among the Veneti. (A portion of this account depends on Paduan sources.)

A complete study of the origin and value of these synchronisms, and of others not noted by Livy, but which may be derived from the references to plagues, famines, etc., would require a detailed treatment of the earliest Roman chronology. I wish here merely to point out the error of Unger ("Römisch-griechische Synchronismen," in the *Sitzungsberichte d. Münch. Akad.*, 1876, p. 592) in stating that certain of these, such as those concerning the deeds of Alexander of Epirus, were added gratuitously by Livy as a result of his reading of Greek authors. Moreover, the subject has not been sufficiently probed by Matzat (*Röm. Chronologie*), who recognizes the Greek origin of the synchronisms in Livy (cf. I, p. 211), but draws back when it comes to the mention of Theopompus (*ibid.*, p. 138) and the synchronism concerning the siege of Regium and the capture of Rome by the Gauls. In this Matzat is too much influenced by the passage in Pliny (*N. H.* iii. 57): "Theopompus, ante quem nemo mentionem habuit, urbem dumtaxat a Gallis captam dixit." These words, however, do not show that Theopompus named the year of Rome's capture, and Matzat has overlooked the fact that Pliny is here in error

Livy naturally owes his information to Roman sources, but these in turn were doubtless derived from Siceliot writers. In the second half of the fifth century Campania became Oscan, and Magna Graecia at about the same time was invaded by Lucanians, and a century later by the Brettians. It is therefore allowable to suppose that some Siceliot rather that Italiot historian followed in the footsteps of Antiochus and Philistus in comparing the history of central Italy with that of Magna Graecia and Sicily. What we know concerning Timaeus corresponds with the supposition that he was one of the historians whom we are seeking.

From Cicero we learn that Timaeus as well as Philistus was read and esteemed in the first century B. C., and the very polemic of Polybius against him shows how he was read and admired in the preceding century, in which the Roman annals commenced. These annals followed the lines laid down by the histories of Greek origin, which had by that time become falsified and rhetorical.

Timaeus was certainly studied by Varro and Vergil, for the history of Rome and Italy, and it is more than probable that he was also drawn upon by the earliest annalists, who wrote about a generation after the appearance of the history of this learned and eloquent Siceliot historian. Timaeus connected the origin of the Gauls with Sicily, saying that they were descended from the Sicilian Cyclops and the nymph Galatea. The explanation of this tradition is found in the alliance which Dionysius formed with the

(see above, p. 233, note 3), since Rome had already been mentioned by Antiochus and Damastes. We know, on the other hand, that Philistus took the chronology into consideration, since in his history of Sicily he used as a criterion the chronological list of victors in the Olympic games (see Steph. Byz., s. v. Δύμη), and with pretended chronological exactness indicated the passing of the Siculi from Italy (i. e., Latium) to Sicily in connection with the Trojan war, with the words: Χρόνος μὲν τῆς διαβάσεως [see Dion. Hal. i. 22] ἦν ἔτος ὀγδοηκοστὸν πρὸ τοῦ Τρωικοῦ πολέμου. Possibly the ὀγδοηκοστόν is an error caused by confusing π′=80 with πέμπτον, and we have to deal with an Olympiad and a calculation made by Hellanicus (*ibid.*), who placed the arrival of the Ausonians guided by Siculus in the πέμπτῳ ἔτει after the coming of the Elymi to the island. Be that as it may, Philistus made use of synchronisms in the history of Sicily which had to deal with Latium, just as did the Siceliot source of Thucydides (possibly Antiochus), who calculated more vaguely by generations.

Gauls in the fourth century.[1] Moreover, if not from Timaeus, at least from some other Sicilian historian is derived the statement of Appianus that Celtus, Galas, and Illyrius were the children of Galatea and Polyphemus, and that, having left Sicily, they gave their names to the regions in which they settled. In regard to the Illyrians, it is enough to remember that they were allies of Dionysius I, and that with them is closely connected the Syracusan colonization in the Adriatic.[2] Besides, Timaeus boasted of the great care which he took in writing the history of the barbarian peoples of the West, and we have already noted that he visited Latium and Rome.

We naturally expect to find such synchronisms as those enumerated above in a writer who paid much attention to chronology, and who called attention, even if on the base of false and erroneous scientific speculation, to the synchronism between the founding of Carthage and that of Rome, which is mirrored in the legend of Vergil concerning the arrival of Aeneas at Carthage and in Latium. Whoever may have been the historian who first noted these various synchronisms, he was certainly a Sicilian, and his example was followed by Fabius Pictor and the earliest Roman annalists, who gave the name of Siculi to both the Volscians and to the earliest inhabitants of Latium.

Even if it were true that in ancient Latium and the regions of central Italy there existed localities recalling the name of the Siculi, this would not prove an early emigration of the Siculi from Latium, such as the disjointed statements of Antiochus and Philistus might lead one to suppose. The report of Antiochus that Siculus was an exile who came from Rome has about the same value as that of Pythagoras, who makes him a citizen of Rome. This latter version is also given by pseudo-Epicharmus.[3]

These theories, as we noted at the beginning, could have been derived only by Sicilian writers. They were connected originally with Antiochus of Syracuse, who stated that the eponymous Siculus of the Siculi came from Rome, and were developed by

[1] Tim., fr. 37 in Müller, *F. H. G.*, I, p. 200; cf. IV, p. 640.

[2] App. *Illyr.* 2; cf. Diod. xv. 13. 2.

[3] Plut. *Num.* 8. 10.

other Siceliot writers, such as the Syracusan Callias, who said that Latinus was the king of the aborigines (or of the Borigoni), and Silenus of Calacte, the contemporary of Hannibal, who was read and quoted by Cicero and Livy, and who located the Hyperboreans at Rome.[1] The Romans transformed into "aborigines" the words "Hyperboreoi" and "Boreigonoi" which the above-mentioned historians had used to indicate the peoples of central Italy, the modern Borini. Roman tradition, from the time of Cato on, asserts that the Siculi were driven out from Latium and the country of the Volscians by the aborigines.[2] This theory is doubtless connected with the doctrine of Philistus, who asserted that the Ligurian Siculi were driven from Italy by the Pelasgians and Umbrians,[3] whom some writers identify with the aborigines.[4]

That the Romans from the very beginning of their chronicles, or from the time of Fabius and Cato, accepted such doctrines is not explained merely by the literary development of Sicily, which from the fifth to the third century produced the principal historians of the West. The main reason lies in the great political and commercial expansion of Syracuse from 474 on, and especially at the time of the Dionysii. Thanks to this expansion, not only Bruttium, which was thought to have been the early home of Siculi even by the writers of the fifth century,[5] but also Metapontum,

[1] See Call. apud Dion. Hal. i. 72; Fest., s. v. *Roma* 266 M.; cf. Silen. apud Sol. i. 15, p. 9 M. Zielinski (Βορέγονοι, in *Xenien der 41ten Versamlung deutscher Philologen, etc.* [Munich, 1891], pp. 41 ff.) has shown that the aborigines were the Βορέγονοι of Lycophron (vs. 1253); that this Greek form preceded the Latin; and, finally, that Βορέγονοι or Βορεγενεῖς is a conception analogous to that of "Hyperborean." Even today the peasants who come down from the Abruzzi to pass the winter on the plains lying toward the Tyrrhenian Sea are called *Borini*. Moreover, the aborigines, the earliest inhabitants of Gaul according to the Greek Timagenes (apud Amm. Marc. xv. 9. 3), are the same as the Hyperboreans mentioned by Herac. Pont. (apud Plut. *Cam.* 22; cf. Liv. v. 37. 2) in connection with the Gauls who took Rome. Probably those who localized the Siculi and aborigines in Latium and among the Volscians are the same as those who localized them among the Gauls, who also, as we have seen, were thought to be of Sicilian origin.

[2] Cat., frr. 5, 7, Peter; Dion. Hal. i. 10 ff.; Fab. Pict., fr. 2, Peter.

[3] Philist. apud. Dion. Hal. i. 22; see above p. 295, note 4. [4] Dion. Hal. i. 13.

[5] Thuc. vi. 2. 4; Polyb. xii. 5. 6. That the tradition in Thucydides deserves

Croton, and Tarentum, were regarded as Sicilian, and the same was said of Buxentum, Palinurus, Cumae and Procida, and of Sinuessa on the Volscian confines.[1] Although the form and thought appear disconnected there is no real error of diction in the words of Festus when he says: "Maior Graecia, dicta est Italia quod eam Siculi [i. e., the Siceliots] obtinuerunt."[2] Certainly at the time of Dionysius all of Magna Graecia, Tarentum included, recognized more or less the hegemony of Syracuse, and the expression "the two Sicilies" is not entirely a product of mediaeval times.

Since the Syracusans exercised such important control over the entire coast of southern, central, and even northern Italy, and had colonies in Corsica, among the Veneti, and on the coast of Umbria and Picenum, and factories, or allied and almost subject cities, on the Tyrrhenian side, we are not surprised at the theories regarding the Siculian origin of the inhabitants of Picenum,

credence is shown by the proper name of Σικαινία in an early inscription of Policastro (Röhl, *Inscr. Gr. ant.*, No. 544).

[1] See Steph. Byz., s. v. Πυξοῦς, Προχύτη (cf. Κύμη), Σινόεσσα. For Palinurus see Horace, *Carm.* iii. 4. 28. Livy (x. 21; 296 B. C.; cf. Plin. *N. H.* iii. 59) says that Sinuessa was a Greek city, called Sinope before the Roman occupation (and the statement may be true, inasmuch as the Greeks adopted native names according to the character of their own language). It is interesting to note that the neighboring Saltus Vescinus recalls the Sicilian Uessa, and that the Volscian city Ecetra is paralleled by the Sicilian Echetla (see above, p. 237, note 4). For Metapontum ἐν Σικελίᾳ, see Apoll. *His mir.* 2. For Tarentum, see Suid. (s. v. Φιλοξένου γραμμάτιον), where he says that Philoxenus, having fled from the quarries ἐν Τάραντι τῆς Σικελίας, did not accept the invitation of Dionysius I to return to Syracuse. Tarentum was an autonomous city, but could be called Sicilian for the same reason that the sea between Greece and Sicily, although entirely Ionian, was called Siculian (see Polyb. i. 42. 4; x. 1. 2; Eratosth. apud Plin. *N. H.* iii. 75). Tarentum may have looked askance at the power of Syracuse at the time of Dionysius I (see Polyaen. v. 8. 2), but had nevertheless, to recognize her superiority, and in part her hegemony, as is shown, for example, by the relations between Archytas and Dionysius II (Aristox. apud Athen. xii, p. 545 *a*; Euph. *ibid.* xv. 700 *d*); by an account relating to the Pythagoreans of Tarentum (see Iambl. *De vit. Pyth.* 189 ff.); and especially by the existence of at least two Syracusan colonies in Apulia. Tarentum and Syracuse seem to have enjoyed friendly relations in the fourth century. The fact that the Tarentines were suspicious of Agathocles, who had been their leader, was one reason why this friendship did not endure till the end of that century and into the third, and why it was even easier for the Romans to subdue them separately one after the other.

[2] Fest, p. 134 M.

Umbria, the Volscian territory, and Latium, nor that the Gauls who invaded Italy and became allies of Dionysius and of Syracuse were considered descendants of mythical Sicilian characters. For analogous reasons the Phocaeans had already evolved the theory concerning the Lydian origin of the Umbrians and Etruscans, and had transplanted the Bebryces from Asia Minor to Spain. From like motives the Rhodian founders of Gela localized in western Sicily the Solymi who dwelt in the mountains back of Rhodian Phaselis in Asia Minor. Similar reasons, too, gave rise to the theory regarding the Trojan origin of the Latins. In the same way, as a result of the above-mentioned political circumstances, the history of Sicily and Syracuse became a model for that of Rome. Nor is this all. Just as in the language and cults of the Romans there exist traces of Ionic as well as Doric influence, so in the formation of the pseudo-political and constitutional history of Rome, in addition to Sicily and Greece proper, the Ionic and Doric cities of Magna Graecia exercised their influence. The extent of this we shall endeavor to trace in the following paper.[1]

[1] In regard to the influence of Syracuse on the coast of Etruria, the frequency with which Syracusan coins are there found should be noted. It would be useful to have accurate statistics of finds of this nature on the Adriatic and Tyrrhenian coasts, both of Siceliot and of Italiot coins.

XXI

ITALIOT, SAMNITE AND CAMPANIAN ELEMENTS IN THE EARLIEST HISTORY OF ROME

I

It has often been affirmed that the written history of a people is exactly according to its deserts; but such a statement is true only in part. It is not always easy to distinguish how much of any human action has been either recorded or forgotten, as the case may be, on account of the virtue or the vice of the one performing it. Nor does tradition always represent faithfully the most noteworthy events of the world. In general, it tells us much less than we should like to know. We are very well informed of the idle life of certain emperors, but know little enough of certain great thinkers and statesmen. A wealth of detail has been handed down to us concerning more or less imaginary heroes, such as Romulus and Theseus, but we are not able to form an adequate idea of philosophic and political doctrines which have recreated human knowledge and civilization.

Such is the case in regard to the early history of Latium. We possess scattered legends telling us of kings and of heroes, but these, strictly speaking, have no historical or chronological value. Only rarely, and in the most fragmentary manner, are we informed concerning the origin and development of Italic civilization, and of its contact with the civilization of Greece and its colonies. In spite of this, we are now in a position to assert that, contrary to the statements of several ancient writers, the Roman people did not develop their own military, administrative, and juridical organizations. As a matter of fact, they took them over by slow degrees from the various peoples with which they came in contact, and which had preceded them on the road toward civilization. No one is now ignorant of the fact that even that great body of civil law for which we are so greatly indebted to the Roman

people, represents a series of stratifications which in the final analysis lead us to those great oriental monarchies where history had its origin.

To determine how much of the Egyptian and Babylonian civilizations was transplanted and spread along the coast of Asia Minor, and contributed either to form or to transform the Greek spirit, constitutes one of the vastest and most difficult problems of history. There exist certain elements which would aid in attempting a solution, and it is to be hoped that Egypt, which daily surprises us by discoveries of inscriptions and papyri, will some day enable us better to understand the references of classic literary tradition, in which we find constant allusion to such relations, but containing data which we are not always able to check, and therefore to value properly.

This, however, is a digression. Our present task is to formulate a problem which, though smaller, is no less worthy of attention, namely: How much did Greek influence, as it spread along the shores of Italy, contribute to modify, or to create, the civilization of the Romans?

The influence of Greek upon Latin civilization may be divided into three great periods. The first teachers of the Romans—not to mention the impulses received from the Phoenicians of Utica, Carthage, and Sicily—were the Greek colonists along the shores of southern Italy and Sicily. These were succeeded by Greece proper, and, last of all, by the Hellenistic cities, especially Alexandria and Pergamum. It is not my purpose at present to set forth the importance of each of these relations, and especially those of the last period. To do so would require a volume. Since, however, there are many among us who believe that the Romans derived both their laws and their customs from the Greeks, it should be stated that without a proper study of the Alexandrine age, it is possible to understand neither the art and poetry of the time of Ovid and Catullus, nor the application of those mechanical principles which enabled the Romans to erect their colossal structures during the imperial age.

Roman civilization, far from absorbing them blindly, rejected

more than one of the elements of Greek science. For example, witness the proud disdain with which a Roman scholar observes that his fellow-citizens had been very careful not to introduce and practice the results of medical science. The few Romans who had made themselves famous in this branch of learning were regarded, observes this writer, as deserters, and to some extent as Greeks.[1] And yet this despised learning had created, not only the doctrines of the school of Hippocrates, but also those of such Italiots as Alcmaeon of Croton and Heraclides of Tarentum, and had already produced numerous physiologists and anatomists, followers in the footsteps of Erophilus and Erasistratus. Instead of nourishing itself on vain theoretical disquisitions, or on simple empiricism, the science of medicine in Alexandria had adhered to the experimental method, and had even practiced vivisection on the bodies of criminals.

Roman writers, intent upon recording the military virtue and political triumphs of their own race, began only at a late period to recognize and praise the literary achievements of the conquered Greeks. But while conceding to Greece a literary and artistic supremacy which they would hardly have been able to deny, they were always loath to admit how much they owed the Greeks with respect to political and military science.[2] This

[1] Plin. *N. H.* xxix. 16 ff.: "solam hanc artium Graecarum nondum exercet Romana gravitas, in tanto fructu paucissimi Quiritium attigere, et ipsi statim ad Graecos transfugae."

[2] Although in a few cases Cicero does not hesitate to confess the superiority of Greek over Latin culture (e. g., *Pro Archia* 23; *Pro Flacco* 62; *Tusc.* iv. 4), on other occasions (the passage *De orat.* i. 197 represents merely the opinion of one of the interlocutors of the dialogue) he shows himself persuaded of the superiority of Roman culture; e. g., *Tusc.* i. 1: "sed meum semper iudicium fuit omnia nostros aut invenisse per se sapientius quam Graecos, aut accepta ab illis fecisse meliora, quae quidem digna statuissent in quibus eleborarent. nam mores et instituta vitae resque domesticas ac familiares nos profecto et melius tuemur et lautius, rem vero publicam nostro maiores certe melioribus temperaverunt et institutis et legibus. quid loquar de re militari? in qua cum virtute nostri multum valuerunt, tum plus etiam disciplina." But this is the same Cicero who in the same work (*Tusc.* iv. 4), after declaring that Appius Claudius was a Pythagorean, says: "multa etiam sunt in nostris institutis ducta ab illis, quae praetereo, ne ea, quae repperisse ipsi putamur, aliunde didicisse videamur." The real point was touched upon by Cicero himself where (*Tusc.* ii. 5) he exhorts the Latins to

repugnance was still felt at the time of Cicero, the great creator of Latin literature, although he was very well aware how much Rome owed to Greece, and to what extent during the preceding two centuries Greece had dominated, with the arts of civilization, over her proud conqueror. It was much more keenly felt, however, at an earlier period, when Rome barely deigned to glance at the works of art, and at the literary and philosopic doctrines, of a conquered people—art and doctrines which she was not as yet able to appreciate fully.

Notwithstanding this studied demeanor, the traces of the influence of the conquered over the conqueror emerge very clearly, and this not only at a relatively late epoch, when Rome had come into direct contact with Greece proper, but also at a more remote age, when the hellenizing of the Latins was furthered more especially by the Greeks of southern Italy and Sicily.

The invasion of the Sabine races, which soon barbarized the coast of Magna Graecia, and which took place at about the same time that the writing of history began to flourish among the Italiots, together with the increasing prosperity of the cities of Sicily, especially Doric Syracuse (after the battle of the Himera, 480 B. C.), makes it less difficult for us to trace the numerous political and literary relations which existed between Rome on the one hand, and the Siceliots and Magna Graecia on the other. The relations with Sicily have already been discussed, at least partly, in the preceding essay. The following pages will attempt to trace the connection between Magna Graecia and Latium. The difficulties which beset this task have already been set forth, and forbid its being treated as befits its importance. I shall consider the present paper merely as a formulative attempt, which will, I hope, have its greatest value in inciting others to a better

transplant into Latium the cult of philosophy also: "ut huius generis laudem, iam languenti Graeciae eripiant." It is difficult to understand the attitude of such a writer as Horace, who recognizes without reserve that the Latins had been civilized by the Greeks (it is hardly necessary to recall the passage *Ep.* ii. 1. 185 f., "Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artes intulit agresti Latio"), unless we remember that Horace, although of Roman origin, was born in a country thoroughly under the influence of Greek civilization. Cf. my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, p. 591.

definition of the elements which are here merely outlined, or which have escaped me altogether.

In order to better understand our subject, it will be of aid to discover what commercial impulses spread themselves along the shores of Latium, and to what degree these crossed one another. A full comprehension of the history of this commerce helps us greatly in explaining the political relations of the various states, and in determining what forms of speech, and even what literary forms, have passed from one people to the other. It would certainly have been of the greatest value for our subject to have had a text anterior to the Punic wars, or, better yet, before the fourth century, when Campania was conquered, analogous to the one in which Cato enumerates the places from which agricultural supplies were best secured. Cales, Minturnae, and Suessa, according to Cato,[1] furnished farm implements; Pompeii, Nola, and Capua, objects used in the oil industry; from Venafrum came tiles; from Nola and Capua, vases of every description; from Capua alone hemp rope and twine. It is true that these various local industries were not all created at the time of Cato, but had their origin several centuries earlier. It is more than probable that even before the fourth century the kitchen utensils and bronze vases which Cato mentions found their way to the plains of Latium, a region which both agriculturally and commercially was always tributary to Campania.

Of far more value than the data of Cato for explaining the more remote periods are numerous and eloquent documents which for the most part are still buried in the earth. There exist, it is true, scattered through the museums of central Italy, vases which have been attributed to various regions of southern Italy

[1] Cat. *De agric.* 135: "Calibus et Minturnis cuculliones, ferramenta, falces, palas, ligones, secures, ornamenta, murices, catellas: Venafro palas. Suessae et in Lucanis plostra, treblae Albae: Romae dolia, labra: tegulae ex Venafro. aratra in terram validam Romanica bona erunt, in terram pullam Campanica, iuga Romanica optima erunt: vomeris indutilis optimum erit: trapeti Pompeis, Nolae ad Rufri maceriam: claves, clostra Romae: hamae urnae oleariae, urcei aquarii urnae vinariae, alia vasa ahena Capuae, Nolae: fiscinae Campanicae† eame utiles sunt, funes subductarios, spartum omne Capuae: fiscinas Romanicas Suessae, Casino, optimae erunt Romae." Cf. 22, 107, 146, 153 *et passim.*

as their place of origin. But, so far as I know, we still await a definitive work by means of which we may be able to establish which of the different cities of Magna Graecia sent their wares to the markets of Etruria and Latium, and, let us add, of Liguria also, and what mutual relations and interests existed between these various currents. Such a problem can be completely solved only when the Italian government shall explore the various regions of Latium by means of ample and rigorously scientific excavations. In this district there are a very large number of places which still await the spade of the archaeologist. Surely, the intact condition of certain portions of the great Latin plain gives reason to suppose that the vases still buried there are no less numerous than in Etruria. Let us note, in passing, that there is almost no literary tradition in this regard. There is a possible allusion to a trade in vases in the legend of the Corinthian Demaratus who came to Tarquinii, but I have elsewhere had occasion to remark that such a myth is easily explained if we bring it into connection with the commerce of Corinth from the seventh and sixth centuries on, and with that of Corinthian Syracuse, especially after 480 B. C.[1]

Roman tradition, on the other hand, alludes frequently to the dependence of Latium upon Etruria in agricultural matters, and above all upon Campania. In spite of serious chronological errors to which ancient writers also have alluded, the true state of affairs appears with remarkable clearness from the statement that during the famines which afflicted Rome during the fifth century, Cumae and Capua sent her the desired supplies. The Roman annalist also affirms that Rome demanded grain from the Samnites of Capua shortly after they had become masters of the Campanian plain, as also from the Etruscan Volturnum, and that her demands met a harsh and proud refusal. True or false, this statement mirrors admirably the general hostile relations which existed between Capua and Rome, especially after the time of Pyrrhus, at the period when the Latin annalists became active. It is equally

[1] With Demaratus of Corinth are said to have come the artisans Euchir, Diops, and Eugrammus (Plin. *N. H.* xxxv. 152). Euchir is nothing but a localization of the mythical Euchir, brother-in-law of Daedalus (Plin. *N. H.* vii. 205), inventor of the art of painting. For the value of this myth see the preceding article, p. 241.

certain that the superiority of Campanian to Roman soil obliged the inhabitants of Latium more than once to make purchases of grain in the same region which they eagerly seized after the fourth century. Thus in general the account in the Roman annals appears worthy of credence, although the critic must reduce to their true value the details which embellish such legends as those of Coriolanus and of Spurius Melius.[1] In this connection it is worth while to note that with these legends, and with the importation of grain and other supplies into Rome, the introduction of the plebeian cults of Mercury and Ceres must be related. Elsewhere I have sought to show the value of such cults in explaining the legends of Menenius Agrippa, Coriolanus, Sp. Cassius, and Sp. Melius, and how they derived vigor from the commercial relations with Sicily and Magna Graecia. Here I may be permitted to recall merely that the Italic Ceres, owing to the relations with the cities of Sicily and Magna Graecia, became identified with Demeter, and was henceforth honored according to the Hellenic rites. But this plebeian divinity, only at a late period recognized officially by the patricio-plebeian state, was never granted Roman priestesses, and much less those of patrician origin.[2] From an inscription we learn of one of the priestesses who was a Sicilian by birth. Cicero states that still in his time Velia and Naples were the cities whence those who were to attend to the cult of the Greek Ceres came to Rome, and that these priestesses were rewarded with the citizenship in their new home.[3] The importance of the cult of Demeter at Naples is well known and hardly requires mention.[4]

The observations in regard to grain hold, though to a less

[1] Liv. ii. 41; iv. 25, 52. I also refer to the previous essay, and to my *Storia di Roma*, I, 1, pp. 510 ff.; 2, p. 238.

[2] Cf. the preceding article, and my *Storia di Roma*, I, 1, chap. iv.

[3] Cic. *Pro Balbo* 55; cf. *CIL*, VI, 2181. The Greek origin of the cult of Ceres, notwithstanding the Italic name of the goddess, is attested throughout antiquity; e. g., Fest. 237 M., s. v. *Peregrina sacra*. The granting of citizenship to a foreign priestess is a juridical consequence of the citizenship granted to the goddess herself.

[4] Stat. *Silv.* iv. 8. 50. For the Neapolitan inscriptions relating to the cult of this goddess, see Beloch, *Campanien*, p. 50. It is possible that one of the three *decumani* of the city was named from Demeter (via Nilo ?); see Beloch, *op. cit.*, p. 70.

degree, for olives and grapes. According to the historian Fenestella, at the time of Tarquinius Priscus the olive did not exist in Italy, Spain, or Africa. But it is a question whether Pliny, when he quoted this author, reproduced his text accurately, or whether Fenestella, if he really expressed himself thus, followed his own sources exactly. It is hardly credible, even if the olive were totally unknown on the Italian peninsula, that it did not exist among the Achaean and Dorian colonies, brought with them from the Peloponnese when in the eighth century they civilized a great portion of the coast of the Ionian Gulf. The statement of Fenestella probably must be accepted with some reserve, and stress be laid merely on the rarity of the olive in Italy about the year 581 B. C.[1]

It is true that on the most ancient coins of the Italiot cities the olive is represented much less frequently than the sheaf of wheat and the bunch of grapes. It is, however, indubitably present on the coins of the second period of Velia,[2] which go back to the beginning of the fifth century, and it is hardly possible that it could have been lacking in the cult of Apollo, the special divinity

[1] Plin. *N. H.* xv. 1: "Fenestella vero omnino non fuisse in Italia Hispaniaque aut Africa Tarquinio Prisco regnante ab annis populi Romani CLXXIII" (=581 B. C.). We are ignorant of Fenestella's sources, but his statement has been properly brought into connection with that of Herodotus (v. 82), who says that Athens alone possessed olive trees. But that the olive existed in Elis at a very remote period, and was not imported from Athens, is shown by the fact that, while in Athens the victors in the games were crowned with olive branches, at Olympia they used for this purpose the wild olive (cf. Plin. *N. H.* xv. 19). For the original provenience of the olive see Hehn, *Kulturpflanzen und Hausthiere*, VI, pp. 101 ff. Among other things, Hehn points out that the Latin words relating to the oil industry, such as *amurca, orchis, trapetum*, are derived from the Greek (cf. Weise, *Die griech. Wörter im Latein*, Leipzig, 1882). The supposition that the myth of Aristaeus alludes to the influence of the Phoenicians in introducing the olive (see Hehn, *op. cit.*, p. 111) has, I think, no foundation. The myth of Aristaeus is manifestly of Greek origin, and its localization in Sardinia (see my *Intorno alla Storia di Olbia*, Sassari, 1895) falls in with the relations which existed between that island and Sicily (whither Aristaeus is said to have returned) during the sixth, fifth, and fourth centuries B. C.

[2] Cf. the coin shown by Garrucci, *Le monete d'Italia antica*, Plate 118, Fig. 38, the style of which would date it about 500–450 B. C. (cf. Head, *Hist. num.*, p. 74). So far as I know, the olive branch does not appear on vases of Magna Graecia before the fifth century. It must also be remembered that on vases, as on coins, it is not always easy to determine whether olive or laurel leaves are intended.

of all the Italiots, and indeed protector of Greek colonization itself, to whom it was customary to offer the sacred branch, the εἰρεσιώνη, on the occasion of the Pyanepsia and the Thargelia.[1] Surely there could have been no lack of oil in rich Croton, in Metapontum, and in Sybaris, whose athletic contests became so popular as to rival those of Olympia.[2] To be sure, some importance must be attributed to the tradition which declares the olive to be sacred to Athens, and to the laws by means of which that city tried to monopolize the trade in oil. Nor were the pretensions of Athens to the ownership of any land capable of producing the olive a mere matter of words.[3] It cannot be denied that the numismatical evidence attesting the abundance of the olive in Italy does not reach back of the fifth century. The time when Attic Thurii was founded represents one of the periods in which the olive was especially spread along the shores of Calabria, Campania, and Apulia. The coins of Apulia bear witness to such a culture, and also to the commercial relations which existed between that region and Athens in the fourth century, at which period it received an Attic colony.[4]

[1] Cf. the passages collected by Mommsen, *Feste der Stadt Athen*, pp. 57, 144, 279.

[2] That the ancient Sybarites (before 510 B. C.) held games similar to those of Olympia is expressly asserted (see Pseud.-Scymn. 349 ff.; Heracl. Plat. apud Athen. xii. p. 521*e*). The same thing was also said of the people of Croton (see Tim. apud Athen. xii, p. 522 *b* [=fr. 82 M.]). We learn of games at Metapontum from a rare didrachm dating from the first half of the fifth century. (For its correct interpretation see Kinch, *Rev. num.*, II [1898], pp. 71 ff.) On it, however, is not represented the olive, but a marsh plant, on which leans the god of the river Achelous.

[3] Cf. Herodot. v. 82; and Cic. *D. R. P.* iii. 9. 15: "Athenienses iurare etiam publice solebant omnem suam esse terram, quae oleam frugesve ferret."

[4] The presence of the owl and the olive in connection with various cities of Apulia such as Teanum, Apulum, and Butuntum (see Garrucci, *op. cit.*, Plates 112, Figs. 5–8; 117, Fig. 7; coins in general of about 300 B. C.), would seem to allude to the influence of Athens in these regions; and, in fact, we know of an Attic colony planted on the Italian side of the Adriatic about 324 B. C. (cf. *CIA*, II, 2; and my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, p. 589). Thus may also be explained the cult of Athena which existed at Rubi (Garrucci, *op. cit.*, Plate 114, Fig. 32). On the other hand, it must not be forgotten that by means of the Tarentines the olive became widely spread on the Messapian peninsula, where it was known by the

Be that as it may, the statement of Pliny that in 249 B. C.—that is to say, eight years before the end of the First Punic War—two pounds of olive oil cost ten *asses*, while in 74 B. C. one could purchase ten pounds, for one *as*,[1] proves how little, if any, oil was produced in Latium. Indeed, toward the end of the fourth century, when Rome began to coin money and make definite the valuation of fines, ten *asses* represented the value of a sheep and a tenth part of the price of an ox. The ox represented the highest unit of value, and from it, just as from the sheep, came the word *pequnia*, "money."[2] Remembering that the ratio of value between the *as* of 249 B. C., spoken of by Pliny, and the most ancient *as* was about as 1 to 2½, it follows that the sum necessary to purchase an ox in the fourth century would not buy fifty pounds of oil. At Athens, on the other hand, for one *obolus* one could buy three *cotulae* of oil; that is to say, a kilogram for a little over an *obolus*. Thus at about the same period oil cost about fifteen times as much at Rome as at Athens.[3]

Moreover, the price of ten *asses* for two pounds represents an under- rather than an over-valuation. From another passage in Pliny, which the texts hitherto have given incorrectly, but which seems to me to be easily emended from what has just been said, it results that this price held in 249 B. C., the year after that in which, thanks to the conquest of Palermo and the triumph of the proconsul L. Caecilius Metellus, all of the principal food supplies—grain, wine, dried figs, meat, and oil—were brought in abundance to the markets of Rome, and at a fairly low price.[4] The conquest

name of *oliva sallentina* or *oleastellus* (Cat. *De agricult.* 6; Colum. xii. 49). As to the oil of Thurii, suffice it to note that it was alluded to by Amphis apud Athen. i. 30 *b;* ii. 67 *b;* that is to say, by an Athenian comic poet of the middle of the fourth century.

[1] Plin. *N. H.* xv. 1.

[2] Varr. *D. L. L.* v. 95; Fest., p. 144 M., s. v. *maximam multam;* p. 202 M., s. v. *ovibus;* p. 237 M., s. v. *peculatus;* cf. Paul. *Ep. Fest.*, p. 24 M., s. v. *aestimata poena;* Dionys. x. 50; Gell. *N. A.* xi. 1.

[3] *CIA*, II, 1, nos. 631, 695; cf. the discussion from these data by Mommsen, *Feste der Stadt Athen*, p. 77.

[4] Plin. *N. H.* xviii. 17: "M. Varro auctor est cum L. Metellus in triumpho plurimos duxit elephantos, assibus singulis farris modios fuisse, item vini congios

of Sicily was therefore of great importance for Rome, both for her grain and for her oil supply. It is obvious, however, that before the time of Cato, who makes explicit mention of the fact, the oil of Pompeii, Nola, and other regions of Campania was in demand in Rome. Moreover, the pan-Athenaic amphorae, which after the sixth or fifth century were eagerly sought for in the markets of Etruria and Latium, came filled with the precious oil, which to such an extent nourished the commerce both of wealthy Athens and of the Italiot Thurii, and which became as famous as that of the Sallentine peninsula. We have every reason to believe that the olive was introduced into Latium from Campania, where it was cultivated as far as Venafrum. At any rate, that oil was brought to Rome at an early period from the regions of southern Italy is shown by the fact that the image of Saturn, to whom there was erected a temple in the Roman Forum in 348 B. C., was filled with oil. Let it here be observed that ancient writers expressly attest the fact that the cult rites of this divinity were of distinctly Greek, and not of Latin, character, although the god himself was indigenous.[1]

Much older than the cultivation of the olive is certainly that

fici siccae pondo XXX, olei pondo X, carnis pondo XII." This, however, contradicts another passage of Pliny *N. H.* xv. 2: "urbis quidem anno DV Appio Claudio Caeci nepote L. Iunio cos. olei librae duae denis assibus veniere, et mox anno DCLXXX, M. Seius L. f. aedilis currulis olei denas libras singulis assibus praestitit populo Romano per totum annum." According to these two different passages, in 250 B. C. the year of the triumph of Metellus, one pound of oil cost ten *asses;* in 249 B. C. two pounds could be had for the same price. But since Pliny (xviii. 17), in speaking of the price in 250, cites it among the cases of great reduction, it seems more than probable that the price in 249 was the same as that in 250. And since the agreement between *denis assibus* and *denas libras* makes it probable that the passage xv. 2 is correct, it follows that the other passage should be corrected.

[1] Plin. *N. H.* xv. 32: "veteri quoque usus est ad quaedam genera morborum existimatur et ebori vindicando a carie utile esse. certe simulacrum Saturni Romae intus oleo repletum est." That the temple of Saturn was erected toward the middle of the fourth century, at the time of L Furius Camillus, and not at a much earlier period, as affirmed by dubious tradition, we learn from the annalist Gell. apud Macrob. i. 8. 2, where the different traditions are mentioned, and where it is stated that the rites of Saturn were Greek. This is confirmed by Dionys. i. 34; Fest., p. 322 (*Saturnia*); Plut. *Q. Rom.* 11.

of the vine. This is shown by the coins of Magna Graecia and Sicily, and also by the Roman cults. The legend concerning the Etruscan Mezentius, who wished to make the Romans give him the produce of all the vineyards which were cultivated on Latin soil, has no value in proving that the vine was cultivated before the eighth century B. C. and before the arrival of the Greek colonists. The legend proves, however, that the grape industry was associated with the two indigenous and patrician deities, Jupiter and Venus, and that the tradition which mentioned the recent introduction of the olive referred the cultivation of the vine to the very beginning of the Latin race. An examination of the legend shows that it arose as a consequence of the ceremonies pertaining to the cult of Jupiter Latiaris, and that it stood in intimate relation with the prosperous and well-known vineyards of the Alban Hills. It also shows that vines were planted at Rome still earlier than the introduction of the cult of Bacchus or Dionysus.[1]

That the introduction of this last-mentioned divinity of Magna Graecia and Sicily had a certain effect even upon the plebeian cults is shown clearly by the triad Ceres, Libera, and Liber, who correspond exactly to the Demeter, Persephone, and Dionysus worshiped in Sicily, and probably in several regions in Magna Graecia.[2] Wine was not produced abundantly in Latium before the fourth century. This is shown by the fact that it was considered more as a medicine than as an ordinary drink. Suit could even be brought against those who used it immoderately, and a woman who drank of it without the knowledge of her parents could be condemned to death. According to ancient writers, the parents by kissing the woman could discover whether or not she had tasted

[1] The myth of Mezentius and his pretensions to the wine of the Rutili and Latins is spoken of by Cato apud Macrob. iii. 5. 10; cf. Varr. apud Plin. *N. H.* xiv. 88; Dionys. i. 65; *Fast. Praen.* ad d. 23 Apr. (=*Veinalia*); Fest., p. 226: *Rustica Veinalia;* Ovid *Fast.* 879; Plut. *Q. Rom.* 45; cf. also the material collected by Mommsen, *CIL*, I², pp. 316, 325. As to the cult of Venus, which, I believe, was at first joined with that of Jupiter, and was ancient, I do not follow the views of this great critic. I shall give the reasons for this in their proper place.

[2] See above, p. 250.

of the forbidden liquor.[1] Finally, the same legend according to which Mezentius laid claim to the yield of all the vineyards of Latium, shows the precious character of this produce, and proves that the Latins, even earlier than the neighboring Etruscans, had taken to cultivating a plant which throve better in their southern soil than in the colder or more marshy regions north of the Tiber.[2] It would be useless to insist on the circumstance that the Romans commenced to cultivate the vine only at a rather late period, since ancient writers expressly attest this fact,[3] and note that this is the reason why in the earliest sacrifices, which are attributed to the regal epoch, no use was made of wine, but only of milk.[4]

The extensive cultivation of the vine which the Romans carried on in western and southern Europe was not commenced till after the conquest of Campania. It was then that they came into possession of the vineyards of Mount Massicus and of Caccubus, and of the Aminaean vines from Falernum and Salernum, which, according to a statement which takes its origin from Aristotle,[5] were imported by the Thessalians.

[1] For these well-known facts it will suffice to refer to Polyb. vi. 2. 3; and Plin. *N. H.* xiv. 89 ff. The ban upon wine-drinking figures also in the laws of Locri, Ael. *V. H.* ii. 37. From Alcimus Siculus apud Athen. x, p. 441 *a*, we learn that such laws were in force both at Croton and in other Greek cities of Italy.

[2] In regard to the early use of the vine and of wine among the Etruscans and Latins, it is characteristic that the *templum* is connected with the word *vinea*, as may be derived from the legend of Attus Navius (see my *Storia di Roma*, I, pp. 315 ff.). For those who believe that such a division of the vineyards by the cardes and decumanus represents a practice unique among the Etruscans, as even the legend of Attus Navius might lead one to think, it is not out of place to recall that even today in the countries whence the vine originally came, such as Colchis and Armenia, the vineyards are still cultivated and arranged in this manner (see the authorities cited by Hehn, *op. cit.*, p. 64).

It is also a noteworthy fact that the *vitis* was the symbol of the authority with which the centurion was invested. It would be interesting to determine whether the curved pedum of the archaic statue found at Isola di Fano symbolizes the *vitis*. The statue is illustrated by Milani (*N. S.*, 1884, p. 270; *Museo topogr. d. Etruria*), who sees in it a representation of the god Vertumnus—but without reason, as it seems to me.

[3] Plin. *N. H.* xviii. 24: "apud Romanos multo serior vitium cultura esse coepit."

[4] Plin. *N. H.* xiv. 88; cf. Hehn, *op. cit.*, p. 65.

[5] Aristot. apud Philarg. ad Verg. *Georg.* ii. 97. The Aminaean vines were in the course of time planted in various parts of southern Italy, as at Naples (Galen,

I do not propose to treat of the vicissitude of the wine industry in Campania and the other regions of the peninsula after the fourth century. In regard to this part of the material civilization of the ancients let us merely note that the antiquity and importance of the commercial relations between Campania and Rome are shown by the fact that the same unit of linear measure was used in the two regions. The metrological studies of Nissen, confirmed by those of Mau, Dörpfeld, and Richter, show that up to the time of Sulla the foot of 0.278 m. was in use at Pompeii, and also in Latium at Ardea, Lanuvium, Ferentinum, Anagnia, and possibly even at Rome, preceding the introduction of the Attic-Roman foot of 0.296 m. In Rome itself this latter foot seems to have been introduced not earlier than the fifth or the beginning of the fourth century. According to national tradition, it was introduced not earlier than 451 B. C., the time of the decemvirate, when the Romans first came into direct contact with Attica. For my own part, I am disposed to believe that the Attic-Roman foot, which seems not to have been accepted at Tarentum before the fourth century, was received in Rome not earlier than the founding of Attic Thurii (466 B. C.), and possibly much later.[1] We shall be better informed

Meth. Med., XII, 4), in Peucetia (Hesch., s. v. Ἀμιναῖοι), near Sorrento and Vesuvius (Plin. *N. H.* xiv. 21 ff.), and in Calabria (e. g., *CIL*, X, 114). It is not easy to establish where these Thessalian Aminaeans originally located, for in the passage of Macrobius (iii. 20. 6: "nam Aminaei fuerunt ubi nunc Salernum est") the codex Salisburgensis has *Falernum* instead of *Salernum*. The reading *Falernum* is accepted by Eyssenhart, the most recent editor of Macrobius, while Rose (*Arist. q. jereb. libr. fragment.*, n. 495, p. 313) prefers the other. In favor of this hypothesis Rose quotes the passage in Pliny (*N. H.* iii. 70) from which we learn that in the territory of the Picentini, near the Silarus, there was a temple of the Argive Juno, founded by Jason himself. On the strength of this passage I have surmised that at Vietri near Salerno (where, according to Strabo, the ancient Etruscan city of Marcina was located) should be placed the seat of the Aminaeans, to whom Garrucci attirbutes the coin with the inscription Ἀμι, which De Petra (*Arch. stor. p. l. prov. Nap.*, IV, p. 179) erroneously interpreted as *As(ia)* (cf. my *Storia della M. Grecia*, I, pp. 246, 528 ff.), although there is no literary evidence for a town of that name. The passage in Steph. Byz., s. v. Τισία ὡς Ἀσία πόλις Ἰταλίας, does not mean, as generally interpreted, that there was one city in Italy named Tisia, and another in Asia. The author, following his well-known custom, merely observes that *Tisia* has the same ending as *Asia*. In Diod. xxxvii. 2. 13, and Appian, *B. Hann.* 44, we read Ἰσία or Τισία in place of Ἀσία.

[1] See the excellent article of Richter, *Hermes*, XXII (1887), pp. 17 ff.; also

as to this when exact metrological observations have been made on the monuments of Sicily, Magna Graecia, and Latium, which are still for the most part unexplored, and of which the few that have been studied have never been measured with this point in view. In the case of the measure of capacity, there certainly came a time when the Sicilian supplanted that of Magna Graecia. This is shown by such expressions as *medimno siciliano* and *sicilicus*.[1]

The influence of Magna Graecia and Sicily on the coinage of Rome has often been observed. A discussion of the origin of the Roman monetary system, and its connection with those of Sicily and Carthage, would be foreign to my subject. But although Rome, after a period slightly anterior to the First Punic War, felt the necessity of following the system of weights which the commercial power of Athens caused to be generally accepted, it is nevertheless clear that in the types and art of her coinage she continued to feel the direct influence of Campania. Not only during the fourth century, but even to the time of Cato or later, the types of the Italiot cities offered subjects for imitation to the Roman mints. The connection between certain series of Roman and Campanian coins is well known, and I shall limit myself to recalling the types of the earliest Roman quadrilaterals (although some of them date from the beginning of the third rather than from the fourth century), and those of the *aes grave*, which show points of contact with Sicily, and with such cities as Thurii, Croton, and Regium.[2] Finally,

the theories of Dörpfeld, *Ath. Mitth.*, IX (1884), pp. 198 ff.; and cf. *Hermes*, XXII, pp. 79–85.

[1] It is to be hoped that results of observations along this line will some time be published by Koldewey and Puchstein, authors of the work *Die griech. Tempel in Unteritalien u. Sicilien* (Berlin, 1895). As yet they have not been able, or have not desired, to discuss the matter.

[2] That Roman coins, even of a rather late period, sometimes imitate much earlier ones of Italiot cities is shown, for example, by the coins of M. Porcius Cato, nephew of Cato the Elder, struck about 101 B. C., which, as has been noted, recall the types of Terina (see Babelon, *op. cit.*, II, p. 371). Thus the coins of Valerius Acisculus showing Europa and the bull (see Babelon II, p. 519) are explained only when we think of the part taken by the Valerii in the cults of the secular games, and of the fact that these games were introduced from Tarentum.

In regard to the dependence of the earliest Roman coins on the types of the cities of Magna Graecia, suffice it to recall such examples of the *aes grave* as that

special attention should be called to the Roman silver coin with the word Ῥωμαίων, which if not struck shortly after 326 B. C., as some scholars maintain, at least clearly shows the relations with Naples, and was possibly made either in that city or by Neapolitan artists.[1] This coin demonstrates that Rome began to present herself in the Greek world as a Hellenic city, and justifies the epithet πόλις Ἑλληνίς which was given her by Greek writers about the middle of the fourth century. Together with other Roman examples, it shows that Greek cities such as Naples and Velia furnished the types and the workmen for the earliest Roman coins, which in some cases are of such beauty as to seem of Italiot provenience. With this fact is to be connected the circumstance that the local mint of Naples, and especially that of Paestum, existed for so long a time. That of Paestum even survived for a short period the extinction of the remaining municipal mints of Italy.[2]

Conforming with these data are the statements regarding the introduction of the precious metals at Rome. It is quite probable that gold was found in certain regions of Italy in very ancient times.[3] Certainly the *aurifodinae* of the valley of Aosta and that of Sesia were worked by the Gauls, and later by the Romans; but there was never a great abundance of gold and silver found in the peninsula. This explains the fact that copper was the metal which

published by Garrucci (*op. cit.*, p. 39, Plate 70, Fig. 2), found in Calabria near Nicotera, and which appears to imitate the types of Regium. For other points of contact between the Roman and Italiot coinage see the excellent work of Milani, *Aes rude, signatum e grave* (Milan, 1891). I have already cited other examples pertaining to relations between the coinage of Greek Sicily and that of central Italy (see above, pp. 293 f.). It would be of advantage to discover the origin of the quadrans attributed to Tibur (Garrucci, *op. cit.*, Plate 45, Fig. 4). Such subjects deserve special treatment from the hands of future writers on the coins of ancient Italy. Notwithstanding the excellent researches of Cavedoni, Borghesi, Avellino, Garrucci, De Petra, Milani, and Mommsen, there remains much to be accomplished.

[1] See Babelon, I, p. 15.

[2] See Mommsen in *CIL*, X, p. 53.

[3] For the gold mines of the Ictimuli, see the material collected by Mommsen, *CIL*, V, p. 715, to which should be added Plin. *N. H.* iii. 138. (For the topography see Giambelli, *Atti dei Lincei*, 1899, pp. 252 ff.) Cf. pp. 183 f. for the ancient gold mines of Ischia, said to have been worked by the Chalcidaeans (Strab. v, p 247 C.).

among the peoples of Italy and Sicily was used almost exclusively to represent commercial transactions. Of this metal an abundant quantity was found in the mines of Etruria, and from it the Italiots derived much benefit in their commercial relations with the Etruscans on the one hand, and with the Milesians and Attica on the other. We may therefore disregard the statement of Dionysius of Halicarnassus,[1] according to whom the Siculi, when they left Latium, betook themselves to Sicily, carrying treasures of gold and silver. We gladly leave this and other extraneous information to the untrained Italian scientists who have recently laid undue emphasis on the myths of the Siculi and Pelasgians, whom tradition presents as the earliest inhabitants of the peninsula. Take, for example, the reference to the gold which about 389 B. C. the women are supposed to have given their fathers and husbands to redeem themselves from the Gauls. Other ancient writers inform us that the thousand pounds of gold, if that amount was really given the Gauls, either had nothing to do with Rome and is to be referred to some Greek city, or else it was loaned to the Romans by the Greek states.[2]

For our purpose it is enough to observe that at the time of the Samnite wars and the alliance with rich Capua, abundant riches began to flow toward Rome. The Romans themselves declared that they did not commence to become rich till the last Samnite and Sabine wars of Curius Dentatus. This is easily understood, and harmonizes with the account of the rich armor of the Sabine legions, which suggests the relations between these peoples and the Greek cities of Campania and the Tarentine Gulf.[3] Only

[1] Dion. Hal. i. 22. The passage is, of course, accepted by those Italian writers who at the present time, on the base of Dionysius and similar authority, give credence to the ancient fables concerning Siculian or Pelasgic origin, and show a lack of knowledge—or, what is worse, a lack of understanding—of the more certain and accurate results of both Italian and foreign criticism.

[2] See the detailed account of this in my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, pp. 28 ff., 57, 80 ff.

[3] Fab. Pict. apud Strab. v, p. 228 C.=fr. 20 P.: *Ῥωμαίους αἰσθέσθαι τοῦ πλούτου τότε πρῶτον ὅτε τοῦ ἔθνους τούτου κατέστησαν κύριοι*; cf. Plut. *Cat. Maior* 2. Concerning the Samnite legions see Liv. ix. 40; x. 38 ff.; and the passages cited in my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, p. 465, n. 1. For the victories of Mn. Curius, see *ibid.*, in the index where the question of identity between the expres-

after the deliverance of Thurii, which took place about 286 B. C., is there mention of a gold chaplet which was given by the Greeks of that city to a certain Aelius, tribune of the Roman plebs. If an analogous case did happen before this, it could not be referred to a much earlier period.[1] About the time of Pyrrhus and the conquest of Thurii and Croton, the Romans commenced to evade the rigid sumptuary laws which imposed a limited use of silver utensils, and as a result Cornelius Rufinus was expelled from the Senate.[2] Finally, it should be remembered that in this period—that is to say, at a time when the resistance of the Samnites against the Romans commenced to be less vigorous, and just before the arrival of Pyrrhus—there came to Rome several customs from the Italiot cities, such as the refinement of silken garments, and the practice of giving the palm branch to the victors in the games.[3] To this

sions *Sabini* and *Samnites* is discussed. The great difference between the slight use of utensils and arms of precious materials among the Romans, and the luxury of the Campanians, is clearly shown in the account of Livy (ix. 40; 310 B. C.) regarding the different uses to which the two peoples put the Samnite booty.

[1] Plin. *N. H.* xxxiv. 32. Another case is mentioned by Pliny (*N. H.* xxxiii. 38) in speaking of the consul L. Cornelius Lentulus, who rewarded Servius Cornelius Merenda, *Samnitium oppido capto*, with two gold chaplets weighing five pounds. Instead of the consul L. Cornelius Lentulus of 327, who is spoken of as inactive (Liv. vii. 22), this seems to refer to the consul of the same name of 275, who, according to the Capitoline *fasti*, triumphed over the Samnites and the Lucanians. The annalist Cornelius Piso (apud Plin., *loc. cit.*) mentions, it is true, a wreath of gold given by the dictator Postumius Albinus after the battle of Lake Regillus, but this is part of the legend. On the other hand, we may fully accept what Pliny (*N. H.* xxxiii. 11) has to say of the Etruscan gold chaplet which was held suspended above the head of the triumphing Romans at a time when only iron rings were worn at Rome, and those of gold were granted temporarily to ambassadors. And since from Pliny (*ibid.* and ff.) we learn that magistrates did not commence to wear gold rings till the time of Marius, it is clear that we must consider a rhetorical embellishment what is said concerning the gold rings deposited at Rome after the disaster at the Caudine Forks. See Liv. ix. 7. 9: "anuli aurei positi;" cf. my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, pp. 511 n., 565 n.

[2] Dionys. xx. 13; Val. Max. ii. 9. 4; Plut. *Syll.* 1; cf. Cic. *De orat.* ii. 268.

[3] Liv. x. 47: "eodem anno [i. e., 293 B. C.] coronati primum ab res bello bene gestas ludos Romanos spectarunt, palmaeque tum primum translato e Graecia more victoribus datae." See my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, p. 596, n. 2, for a discussion of the value of this passage. I recall here that at about this period, according to the sources of Lydus (*De mens.* i. 19; *De mag.* i. 7), the Romans, in introducing the robes peculiar to magistrates (i. e., ornamented with purple), are said to have

time also doubtless refers the passage in Tacitus to the effect that the Romans brought from Thurii the custom of racing horses in the circus.[1]

I am far from thinking that I have exhausted the list of relations which existed between Latium and Magna Graecia and Campania. It is certain that an examination of the ancient writers would disclose many elements which have escaped me. I merely note, in conclusion, how humble were the dwellings, or rather huts, of the Romans before the age of Pyrrhus. Up to that time, according to Cornelius Nepos, they were covered with *scandula*, or shingles.[2] Nor is it without reason that the three styles of building most used in Rome are called *graeca*, *sicula*, and *campana*.[3] Rather than dwell longer on the relations of a commercial nature and those pertaining to material civilization, I prefer in the following pages to treat of those connected with politics and religion.[4]

imitated Agathocles of Syracuse. For the garments which were later introduced from Campania, see Val. Max. ii. 4. 6.

[1] Tac. *Ann.* xiv. 21: "a Tuscis accitos histriones, a Thuriis equorum certamina." Although tradition either is silent in this regard, or does not offer a definite statement, Naples also must have exercised a certain influence, together with Thurii and Tarentum. For the imperial epoch this has often been surmised; see Civitelli, "I nuovi frammenti di epigrafi greche relative ai ludi augustali di Napoli," *Atti dell' Accad di Archeologia* (Naples, 1894), pp. 53 f. But the influence of Naples, if it existed, must date from the end of the fourth, or at least the beginning of the third, century B. C.

[2] Corn. Nep. apud Plin. *N. H.* xvi. 36: "scandula contectam fuisse Romam ad Pyrrhi usque bellum annis CCCCLXX Cornelius Nepos auctor est." The year 470 of Rome, according to Cornelius Nepos, corresponds to 282 B. C., because he places the founding of Rome in the second year of the seventh Olympiad (cf. Sol. i. 27). This, as I have brought out elsewhere, shows the falsity of the passage in Diodorus concerning the tiles distributed by the state after the departure of the Gauls, and is eminently suited to a city which had many groves within and near its boundaries, as is clearly shown by history.

[3] Plin. *N. H.* xvi. 225: "firmissima in rectum abies, eadem valvarum paginis et ad quaecumque libeat intestina opera aptissima sive Graeco, sive Campano, sive Siculo fabricae artis genere spectabilis."

[4] Whoever wishes to continue with similar research should notice, above all, the derivations of Latin words from the Greek; as, for example, in the article of Weise (*Rhein. Mus.*, XXXVIII [1883], pp. 540 ff.), and more fully in his excellent work, already quoted, *Die griech. Wörter im Latein.* Thus one might inquire into the customs regarding food, dress, etc., which came from Sicily and Magna Graecia;

II

The Romans were justly proud of their military system, the excellence of which is said to have aroused the admiration of the Epirote Pyrrhus;[1] but they themselves recognized that the oldest features of this system were patterned after the Greek phalanx.[2] It is certain, as tradition itself admits, that Rome borrowed both arms and institutions from the various peoples of the peninsula. The Tyrrhenians, inventors of the war trumpet, taught them to use round shields covered with copper. From the Samnites the Romans learned the use of various weapons of offense, and during the wars against this nation, as we learn from a Greek text recently discovered by Arnim, they felt the need of organizing their cavalry. Tradition shows that the earliest Roman armies made use of war chariots similar to those which elsewhere—as, for example, in Boeotia—we find in use as late as 506 B. C., or even down to the battle of Delium (424 B. C.). By tradition we are also informed that the Roman cavalry was modeled after that of the Tarentines.[3]

for example, the custom of shaving (see Varro *D. R. R.* ii. 11. 10); that of dining in Greek style; and, especially, the use of Sicilian and Italiot dainties (e. g., for the *ὄψον θουριανόν*, see Athen. vi, p. 274 *d*).

[1] Plut. *Pyrrh.* 16. 6: *τάξις μὲν εἶπεν, ὦ Μεγάκλεις, αὕτη τῶν βαρβάρων οὐ βάρβαρος.*

[2] Liv. viii. 8. 3: "clipeis antea Romani usi sunt; dein, postquam stipendarii facti sunt, scuta pro clipeis fecere; et quod antea phalanges similes Macedonicis, hoc postea manipulatim structa acies coepit esse." The error of Livy lies in speaking of Macedonian phalanxes, instead of the Greek system in general. It is hardly necessary to recall that before the fourth century the Romans could not have known of the Macedonian phalanx.

[3] That the Roman knights first fought in chariots appears clearly from the myth of Metius Fufetius, whose body was attached to chariots drawn by quadrigae (Liv. i. 28. 10). Nor should we be surprised that this custom lasted so long in Rome, since we find it among the Thebans in 424 B. C. (Diod. xii. 70), and since we know that war chariots were used by the Persians up to the time of Alexander the Great, and even later.

It is known that the cavalry system was borrowed from the Greeks, from the ceremony of the *transvectio equitum* connected with the cult of Castor and Pollux, which is said to have been instituted in 304 B. C. (Liv. ix. 46; cf. my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, p. 607, n. 1). The incomplete text of Granius Licinianus (p. 5, ed. Bonn) speaks of Castor and Pollux, and of the cavalry imitating that of the Spartans at the time of Tarquinius Priscus, in the passage where he discusses the insti-

This is more readily understood when we remember that the great wars generally known by the name of Samnite were more or less openly sustained by the money and counsel of the Tarentines, who were enabled to bring over to their side no small part of the Samnite tribes, and who openly summoned the aid of Pyrrhus when their Italian confederates thought it best to recognize the supremacy of Rome.[1]

The superiority of Tarentum in military matters did not influence the peoples of Italy alone. After the time of Alexander we find the so-called *Tarantina* cavalry system in various Hellen-

tutions of this king, and attributes to him the practice that each knight should receive two horses. With Castor and Pollux was connected the myth of the victory of Lake Regillus; see, e. g., Livy (ii. 20) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (vi. 13), who give the localization in Latium of the appearance of the Dioscuri near the Sagrum. In regard to the *desultores*, who also appear on the coins of Suessa Aurunca, and to the Tarentine cavalry, which was imitated, not only by the Romans, but also by Alexander the Great and his successors, see my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, p. 607, nn. 1 ff.

The creation of the Roman cavalry at the time of the Samnite wars is explicitly attested by the *Ineditum Vaticanum* of Arnim, in *Hermes*, XXVII, 1891, p. 121. This statement should be compared with that of Sall. *Catil.* 51. 38, "arma atque tela militaria ab Samnitibus . . . . sumpserunt," and with the analogous passages in Diod. xxiii. 2, and in Athen. vi, pp. 274 f, which instead of coming directly from Posidonius (see Athen., *loc. cit.*), seem to be derived from some such historian as Polybius (vi. 25), who repeats the same idea, and who very probably set it forth in greater detail in some other place in his writings. It is possible that Polybius depended upon Cato for his information. At any rate, the statement that in his time the armament of both the Roman infantry and the cavalry was similar to that of the Greeks (see Polyb. vi. 3. 7) should persuade even the most skeptical that the Roman military system was more dependent upon that of the Greeks than is generally admitted. For the *Bruttianae parmae*, see Paul, *Ep. Fest.*, p. 31 n.; cf. the coins of the Bruttians.

Tradition speaks, it is true, of modifications in the arms of the Romans at the time of Camillus and the capture of Veii, and this has been made the basis for modern treatment of the subject; see Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverwaltung*, II², pp. 330 ff. But sufficient attention has not been paid to the other elements already brought out, nor to the fact that one tradition refers to a certain Sulpicius and the year 358 a course of action which others attribute to Marcus Camillus (cf. App. *B. G.* 1). Possibly more truth is contained in the narration regarding the reorganization of the Latin army about 340 B. C. (Liv. viii. 8); that is to say, at the time of L. Furius Camillus, who was often confused with M. Camillus; unless, indeed, these reforms refer only to the infantry.

[1] Cf. Zonar. viii. 2.

istic armies. And this superiority did not manifest itself merely in the equipment of the knights, since it was Tarentum who produced Heraclides, inventor of certain engines of war which were used even by Philip V of Macedon.[1]

Up to the time of the Samnite wars Rome was accustomed to rely chiefly upon the infantry for her strength, and even the supreme leader of the army fought on foot. In the military uprising of 299 B. C. against the Roman general Pontius Telesinus, the aged Fabius Verrucosus is said to have been the first to appear on a field of battle seated upon a war-horse.[2]

Rome in general remained faithful to this principle of tactics. Thus we know that one of the causes of the early and sudden victories of Hannibal was the superiority of the Punic cavalry. Even the Campanians were in this regard always superior to the Romans, and it was precisely the greater number of cavalry in the contingent of the Samnites from Capua which caused the Romans to place greater reliance on the strength of their allies than on their own.

When at the time of Hannibal the Romans undertook the siege of Capua, they were not able to avail themselves of the Campanian *equites* who had remained faithful, since it had seemed best to have them fight elsewhere.[3] They then clearly recognized the weakness of their system and introduced the *velites*—an expedient which, according to a hypothesis which I have elsewhere set forth, served to embellish and augment the legend of the augur Attus Navius.[4]

The military system of the peoples of southern Italy, whether Greek or native, and whether of Tarentum, Campania, or Samnium, was superior to that of the Romans. With this fact should possibly be more closely connected than is generally believed, the organization of the gladitorial games, which, according to an early tradition, were introduced from Etruria. These games are mentioned

[1] Athen. xiv, p. 634 *b;* cf. vi. 251, and Polyb. xiii. 4. 6.

[2] Oros. iii. 22. 8; cf., however, Plut. *Fab.* 4, and what I have said (*Storia di Roma,* I, 2, pp. 571, 607) concerning the duplications of the undertakings of Fabius Maximus with reference to Q. Fabius Rullianus and Q. Fabius Cunctator.

[3] Liv. xxiii. 31. [4] Liv. xxvi. 4; cf. my *Storia di Roma,* I, 1, pp. 315 ff.

at the time of the Samnite wars, and Capua always remained the most important center for this branch of athletic and warlike training. Moreover, the name of the *Samnites* served to indicate one faction in the Circus games of the Roman.[1]

From a civil and political standpoint the relations between Rome and southern Italy are no less evident. It has already been noted that the word σύγκλητος, to indicate the Senate, was received from some city of Magna Graecia or Sicily, such as Agrigentum or possibly Naples.[2] This latter city is more certainly suggested by the expression δήμαρχος, which was constantly used in official Greek writings to indicate the tribune of the plebs. It is generally supposed that the demarch became the principal magistrate of Naples. This theory, even more than by the inscriptions referring to this office, seems to be supported by the fact that it was accepted by both Titus and Hadrian, although anywhere else they would taken that of *duovir iure dicundo*. Nevertheless, it must not be forgotten that among the Neapolitan inscriptions we find mention of the ἄρχων and of the ἄρχοντες.[3] To explain the coexistence

[1] There is no reason for doubting the statement of Nicolaus Damascenus apud Athen. iv, p. 153 *f*, where he says that the use of gladiators came from Etruria to Rome (about 264 B. C.; see Liv. xvi; Val. Max. ii. 4. 7); cf. also C. O. Müller, *Die Etrusker*, ed. Deecke, II, p. 223. But the fact that the *Samnites* had already appeared as gladiators at Capua (310 B. C.; Liv. ix. 40), the main center of gladiatorial games (see the passages collected by Lafaye in Daremberg and Saglio, s. v., II, 2, p. 1578), and go back farther than the *Galli* and *Thraeces*, and also the fact that there is no special epithet, as there is for the *histriones*, to indicate Etruscan origin (there is, on the contrary, in *lanista;* see Isid. *Orig.* x, p. 247), both go to prove that the Campanians aided in introducing such games at Rome. Possibly such influence was exercised by both peoples, as was the case with the cults of Bacchus, which were introduced into Rome by both the Campanians and the Etruscans; see Liv. xxxix. 8, 13.

[2] Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht*, III, p. 145, n. 2; p. 841, n. 2. For a dedication to the goddess Σύγκλητος at Karabounar, north of the Meander, see *Bull. d. cor. hellen.*, XVIII, 1894, p. 9; for the ἔσκλητος at Syracuse see Hesych., s. v.

[3] The material relating to the ἄρχοντες and to the δήμαρχοι is discussed by Mommsen, *CIL*, X, p. 172; cf. *N. S.*, 1896, p. 105. Sogliano ("L' epigrafe di P. Plozio Faustino," *Mon. dei Lincei*, 1891, p. 565) justly alludes to the grave difficulties which beset this theme. An objection to my hypothesis would be offered by the passage in Spart. *Vita Hadr.* 19, where it is said that this emperor was "apud Neapolim demarchus," and also by the Neapolitan inscription (Kaibel, *I. G. S. I.*, 729) from which we learn the same fact for Titus. Here as at Athens

and correlation of these two magistracies, various hypotheses have been evolved. My own explanation is that at Naples as well as Rome the struggle between the patrician and plebeian elements ended in the full triumph of the plebs. In other words, the same revolutionary movement—more or less embellished with fictitious elements by tradition—which occurred at Rome, and which, according to tradition, dates its origin from the beginning of the Republic, or even from the reign of Servius Tullius, took place in the various cities of Magna Graecia, and in the other cities of Greece and Italy as well. Thus I am led to believe that the development of the power of the tribune of the plebs was the same at Naples as at Rome.

At Rome not only did the *rex sacrorum* recognize the authority of the pontifex, but (which is more important for our purpose) it also happened in the course of time that the cousuls, praetors, and censors, while maintaining the external prestige of their title, in reality became of much less importance than the tribunes of the plebs, who had the right of bringing suit against them, and also of fining them.[1]

That the same sequence of events took place at Naples, at Capua, and elsewhere, is consistent with the laws of history and of mankind. We are not surprised, therefore, that at Naples the demarch possessed greater authority than the archon. And

we should expect to find Hadrian holding the office of archon (Spart., *loc. cit*). But since the inscription of Faustinus given by Sogliano throws light on the passage in Strabo (v, p. 246 C.), and shows that in 71 A. D. the demarch had the greater authority in Naples, we not only understand the passage from the author of the life of Hadrian, but we are led to the conclusion that, in the democratic constitution of Naples, the demarch, just as the tribune of the plebs at Rome, ended by obtaining the advantage, and attained the leading position even in the matter of official precedence, while at Rome, as far as appearances went, the patrician magistracy never lost its prestige.

By this I do not claim to decide a difficult question, which may be settled at a later period by the discovery of some new document. I wish merely to present a hypothesis. Moreover, that the revolutionary process pertaining to the tribunes of the plebs, or *προστάται τοῦ δήμου*, occurred also in the cities of Campania, may be seen, for example, from the history of Cumae at the time of Aristodemus Malacus (Dion. Hal. vii. 4.).

[1] Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht*, II², pp. 304 ff.

it is not improbable that Rome, finding there a system similar to that which she herself developed, should have taken from Naples the title of σύγκλητος or δήμαρχος for use in her correspondence with the Greek cities. Certainly, from Sicily or Magna Graecia, rather than from Greece itself, she borrowed the institution of the plebeian aediles and censors. The exact parallel between the Roman census and the Attic ἐξέτασις has been noted by Mommsen, although he seems wrong in thinking the fact that there were two censors in Sicily at the time of Verres to be a peculiarity of that island. It seems natural to suppose that Rome took this institution from Sicily, or Thurii, or Naples, just as the introduction of foreign grain, and the necessity of providing a magistrate to have it in charge, led to the creation of the plebeian aediles, to the introduction of the plebeian cult of Ceres, and to the selection of the priestesses of the goddess from Sicily, or Velia, or Naples. Finally, it is most reasonable to suppose that the censors and aediles of Thurii and Naples were similar to those of Athens, the metropolis of these two places.[1]

[1] For the Sicilian censors, of whom there were two in each city, see *Cic. Verr.* ii. 131 ff. There is probably an allusion to the quinquennial census in the δία πέντε ἐτέων of the much-disputed Taorminan tablets, and also in the law of Thurii, according to which it was necessary δία πέντε ἐτῶν στρατηγεῖν (Arist. *Pol.* v. 6. 8; p. 1307 Bk.). This system is best explained by bringing it into relation with the chronology of the Olympiads as imitated by Croton and Sybaris, and which, even before the time of Timaeus, seems to have been accepted by Philistus (see fr. 6 M.=Steph. Byz., s. v. Δύμη). We cannot decide with certainty whether there was any connection with the earlier local Greek magistracies of Naples in the case of the ἄρχων δία πέντε ἐτῶν τιμητικός (Kaibel, *Inscr. Gr., Ital. et Sic.*, 741, 742) corresponding to the *IIviri quinquennales* of the Romans.

In regard to Sicily, there is no reason for holding, with Mommsen, that the two censors represent a Roman creation. They represent rather an indigenous magistracy, continued by the Romans much as they continued, for instance, under the name of *lex Hieronica*, an agrarian law which seems in its main features to have been similar to one which was in force at the time of Timoleon. For this see my "Legislazione di Diocle" in the *Studi ital. di filol. classica* (Florence, 1900). A like continuation is shown in the case of the sacred magistracies which, until the time of Caesar, the Romans allowed to thrive in those Sicilian cities to which they did not send colonies. Thus at Syracuse the supreme magistrate remained a priest of Zeus (Diod. xvi. 70. 6; Cic. *Verr.* II. ii. 126), at Catana a priest of Dionysus (*ibid.*, II. iv. 50), and at Cephaloedis was a priest also (*ibid.*, II. ii. 128). A final confirmation is given by the inscriptions of Buscemi (published by Orsi,

Thus from Sicily or Magna Graecia, and not from Greece proper, came probably the statue of Silenus which became the symbol of popular liberty at Rome.[1] And when ancient writers tell us that the Roman constitution was merely an imitation of that of Sparta,[2] it is clear to one who understands the nature and value of tradition that they would in reality have us understand that the Romans, like the Samnites, received the germs of Greek civilization which were spread through the agency of Spartan Tarentum. This conclusion was reached through observation of early usages, both private and public which occur naturally among different peoples. It was spread by the Tarentines, as ancient writers tell us, to the Samnite and Messapian tribes, and through Greek authors received credence also at Rome.[3]

The best example of a political conception which was handed on through the Italiots to the Samnites, and through them to Rome, is given by the very word *Italia*. Whatever may have been the origin and meaning of this name, there is no doubt that it was adopted by the Greeks of Magna Graecia, who called themselves Italiots, and who indicated by this the country which they had colonized and civilized. The title was then claimed by those powerful Sabine tribes which in the first century B. C. still contended for supremacy with Rome, and which succeeded in at least gaining a condition of perfect equality. The Romans applied the words *Italia* and *Italici*, and not *Romani* and *Latini*, to the whole of the territory of the peninsula under their control, and embraced by them more than *Latium vetus* and *Latium adiectum*. It is evi-

N. S., Nov., 1899, p. 458), in which, in connection with the consuls for 35 A. D., mention is made of the ἀμφίπολος ἐν Συρακούσαις.

[1] See above, p. 264.

[2] Athen. iv, p. 274 *f*: μιμησάμενοι (i. e. the Romans) κατὰ πάντα τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων πολιτείαν. The same conception animates the tradition followed by Dion. Hal. i. 13. 23, where he states that the Romans received from the Spartans the institution of the 300 *equites;* cf. Plin. viii. 24. 4.

[3] Strab. V, p. 250. See also my *Storia della Sicilia*, etc., I, p. 613. Those critics who, in noting the points of contact between Roman and Spartan institutions, think their explanation is found in primitive Aryan customs, overlook the fact that these institutions, which are often precisely identical with those of the Aryans, are found among Semitic peoples as well.

dent, however, that this came about much later than the alliance with Capua in 338 B. C., at the time of the much more important league with the Italiots and Samnites.[1] In fact, the Samnites were no less proud of the name of "Italy" than were the descendants of the early Greek colonists.

The origin of the Twelve Tables shows better than anything else the extent of Italiot influence on Rome. The subject is not easy to handle. We possess more or less numerous fragments both of the legislation of Solon and of the various Greek states, and also of the earliest Roman laws; but rarely have characteristic or well-explained portions of any length come down to us. Moreover, the Greek laws contain general principles connected with ideas of property and of the family which are far different from those of the Romans. Thus the Twelve Tables and other Roman laws regarding the family are conceived on the plan of strict agnation, and take no account of the institution of the ἐπικλήρος (a daughter who inherits in default of male issue) which appears in the laws of Athens and Thurii. In these latter laws, on the other hand, we find none of the dispositions regarding the care of orphans which aroused the admiration of the ancient writers who examined the laws of Charondas.[2] The great difficulty involved in making such comparisons is shown by the fact that Mommsen, the most recent and best-known interpreter of the Roman penal code, although he admits the validity of the tradition which affirms the Greek origin of the laws of the Twelve Tables, instead of examining the vast problem in its whole extent, limits himself to one new and noteworthy linguistic proof of such Greek influence.[3]

Ancient writers are unanimous in their opinion that Roman legislation was modeled after that of Athens, and critics (whether or not they reject the mention of the Roman embassy to Athens about 453 B. C.) agree in admitting this tradition of Greek influence to be trustworthy. But, save for a few isolated cases, or

[1] For the origin of the Latin league, see my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, pp. 229 ff. For the difference in meaning between *nomen Latinum* and *socii Italici*, I refer to the splendid pages of Mommsen, *Röm. Staatsrecht*, III, pp. 607 ff., 645 ff.

[2] Diod. xii. 12 f. [3] Mommsen, *Röm. Strafrecht* (Leipzig, 1899), p. 127.

later additions, there was no direct borrowing from a given legislation of earlier date, although later history can offer numerous examples of such borrowing.[1] The fragments of Roman laws which have come down to us give evidence of a more ancient period of legal procedure than can be shown for the Greek cities, or, better yet, for Athens. It will suffice to recall the Roman disposition concerning retaliation (*talio*). If in some fragments of the Twelve Tables there is evidence of later composition, without doubt this shows later additions to the primitive code. I have elsewhere advanced the theory that the real codification of the Twelve Tables, instead of dating from the time of the mythical Virginia and the decemvir Appius Claudius (i. e., about 453–450 B. C.), occurred more probably about 312–304 B. C., at the time of the censor Appius Claudius, and of Cn. Flavius, who for the first time published the civil code, which had hitherto been jealously guarded by the pontifices. Naturally, what was codified about 312–304 was for the most part the customary procedure by which for several centuries the Latin tribes, and particularly the city of Rome, had been governed, and which, through a process of evolution, the chronological phrases of which we can no longer trace, was either modified or amended as necessity demanded.[2]

Certain facts show conclusively that the laws of Solon were not transplanted bodily from Attica, although for certain portions, such as the funerary laws and those pertaining to the right of association, the declarations of the ancients are too explicit to be disregarded. On the other hand, other data show that the Romans had no need of traveling to the distant shores of Attica to learn the results of Greek legislative wisdom. At about the time when the Roman embassy is said to have sailed for Greece, or even in the same year, according to a trustworthy chronological calculation, Athens founded the purely Greek colony of Thurii (446

[1] Take, for example, mediaeval maritime legislation.

[2] See my *Storia di Roma*, I, 1, pp. 569 ff.; II, 2, pp. 630 ff. Those familiar with ancient Germanic legislation will find more than one point of resemblance between it and the earliest Roman codification.

B. C.);[1] and but a few years later, with the aid of Athens, the Rhodian Chalcidian Parthenope awoke to new life under the name of Neapolis (about 433 B. C.).[2]

On the classic soil of Magna Graecia they did not await the spreading of Athenian influence before codifying the laws. The legislation of Locri, known by the name of the law-giver, Zaleucus, and that of the Chalcidian cities of Italy and Sicily, connected, according to tradition, with the name of Charondas, had attained a great reputation either earlier than the time of Solon, or at least at a period but slightly later. With these traditions and legislations are connected rather strange statements concerning Zaleucus and Pythagoras, both of whom are said to have received Roman citizenship. Epicharmus, too, is said to have made mention of relations between Pythagoras and the Romans.[3] I shall not discuss here whether Rome received her knowledge of Hellenic laws through an embassy sent from Greece, as one tradition has it, or rather through some Greek philosopher who came to Rome, as another tradition seems to affirm.[4] Some weight should be given to the version of Tacitus, according to which models for the laws which made up the Twelve Tables were taken, not from Athens alone, but from all the cities which could offer useful ele-

[1] The date of Thurii is discussed by Pappritz, *Thurii, seine Entstehung und seine Entwickelung* (Berlin, 1891).

[2] See my "La missione politica e civile di Napoli nell' antichità, *Flegrea*, Naples, February, 1900.

[3] These passages are discussed in my *Storia di Roma*, I, 1, chaps. i and iv, *passim*. In the prohibition against burying within the city walls, A. Chiappelli ("Sopra alcuni frammenti delle XII tavole nelle loro relazioni con Eraclito e Pitagora," *Archivio giuridico* of Serafini, 1885) sees a connection with the tradition concerning Hermodorus and the teachings of Heraclitus. Another point of contact between the laws of the twelve tables and those of Zaleucus and Charondas seems to me to exist in the laws of Locri and Croton, already referred to, which forbid the use of wine (Ael. *V. H.* ii. 37; Alc. Sic. apud Athen. x, p. 441 *a;* see above).

[4] I hope shortly to treat of this more in detail. The legend of Hermodorus seems to have arisen in opposition to that concerning the embassy to Athens, and is with difficulty connected with the legend referring to the legislation of Servius Tullius, or to the embassy sent to Greece for the same purpose at the time of the kings.

ments for codification.[1] There is also something in the statement of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, according to which the Roman ambassadors not merely betook themselves to Athens, but visited also the Greek cities of Italy.[2] Certainly at Thurii, about 446 B. C., was partially published that codex of Attic laws which is supposed to have gone into effect at Rome either four years earlier or, according to another tradition, in the very same year; and on that occasion considerable choice was exercised in the selection of certain laws of other places.[3] Such selection, according to the version of Dionysius and Tacitus, constituted the chief value of the Twelve Tables. The laws of Thurii were compiled by the sage Protagoras, who collected what was best in those of Locri, of the various Chalcidian cities, of the cities of the Peloponnesus and Crete, and, finally, of Athens. The new code of Protagoras, given out under the name of the aged Charondas, spread from Attic Thurii to Athens, and, either from there or from the Rhodian cities of Sicily, to Cos and Asia Minor, to be finally received in distant Cappadocia.[4]

[1] Tac. *Ann.* iii. 27: "creati decemviri et accitis quae usquam egregia."

[2] Dion. Hal. x. 54: *ἐν δὲ τῷ αὐτῷ καιρῷ παρεγένοντο ἀπό τε Ἀθηνῶν καὶ τῶν ἐν Ἰταλοῖς Ἑλληνίδων πόλεων οἱ πρέσβεις.* I am far from believing, however, that an embassy, properly speaking, occurred, especially at the time and in the way indicated by Dionysius.

It is interesting to note that while those critics who are less disposed to blindly accept all tradition, declare there is some truth in the theory regarding the Greek derivation of the ancient Roman laws, the modern Italian school, which aims to glorify the mythical deeds of our race, and to confirm the less trustworthy side of tradition, refuses the version of ancient writers who unanimously affirm that the Twelve Tables contained laws which imitated in the main those of Athens. Cicero asserts this with all certainty (*Pro Flacco* 62): "adsunt Athenienses unde humanitas docrtina, religio, fruges, iura, leges ortae atque in omnis terras distributae putantur;" also Pliny (viii. 24. 4): "habet ante oculos hanc esse terram quae nobis miserit iura, quae leges *non victis sed petentibus* dederit, Athenas esse quae adeas, Lacedaemonem esse quam regas." For Sparta, see above, p. 328, note 2.

[3] As I have elsewhere observed, the year 446 B. C. in which Thurii was founded, according to the computation of Diod. xii. 7, 9, corresponds exactly to the 453 B. C. of Liv. iii. 32 (system of Varro), and to the 452 B. C. of Dion. Hal. x. 53. In this year, according to these last two authors, the three Roman ambassadors are said to have gone to Athens to study the laws of Solon.

[4] The early statements regarding the life and legislation of Charondas and

Can it be admitted that a later diffusion of this nature took place along the shores of the peninsula? And did that which penetrated from Thurii to Athens, and possibly also to Attic Naples, spread from there and along the coast of Campania to Latium, the region which stood in such close relations with Naples and with Campania? We have too few elements to admit of a positive solution of such problems, although there are too many analogies and other indications to permit us to totally reject the hypothesis. It has often been noted, for example, that a fragment from Theophrastus pertaining to the laws of Thurii, and regarding

Zaleucus have caused modern writers much perplexity, and have led to very dissimilar conclusions. Thus the same set of traditions are ascribed to Zaleucus, to Charondas, and to Diocles of Syracuse. Diodorus states that the lawgiver Charondas lived at the time of the foundation of Thurii, but by other authors he is said to have been almost a contemporary of Solon. At Sybaris, according to Pseudo-Scymnus (vs. 347) were in force the laws of Zaleucus which, according to Ephorus apud Strab. vi, p. 260 C., were selected from the laws of the Cretans, Spartans, and Athenians. We also learn from Ephorus (*ibid.*) that these laws were accepted by the inhabitants of Thurii.

It seems to me that these difficulties are eliminated if we remember that at the time of the founding of Thurii the sage Protagoras of Abdera was intrusted with the formation of the new code for that city (see Heracl. Pont. apud Diog. Laert. ix. 8. 50). In the colonization of Thurii, Dorians, Ionians, and Achaeans took part; in a word, citizens of all Greece; and certainly Protagoras knew of the various laws of these peoples. From this it is clear why it was said that Zaleucus had taken into consideration the legislation of Lycurgus, Solon, and Minos. Admitting that the code of Locri was in part accepted by the neighboring Thurii, it is seen why Zaleucus was regarded as the lawgiver of the last-named place. Finally, the fairly widespread tradition that Zaleucus and Charondas lived at the time, and were followers of Pythagoras (see Diog. Laert. viii. 1. 16; Iambl. *De vit. Pythag.* 33, 104, 130, 172; Porphyr. *De vit. Pythag.* 21) acquires meaning only when we recognize that the Pythagorean doctrines had the same influence upon the constitution of Thurii and Locri that they did upon that of Tarentum. The fact that Charondas, although a contemporary of Solon, is reported as living at the time of Pythagoras and of the foundation of Thurii finds, as I have elsewhere noted (see my *Storia di Roma*, I, 1, pp. 580 ff., and my article entitled "A proposito della legislazione di Diocle Siracusano," Florence, 1899), a parallel in the actions of Appius Claudius, the censor of 312, which are in part attributed to Appius Claudius, the decemvir of 452–450 B. C.

For the spreading of the laws of Charondas to Athens, see Hermipp. apud Athen. xiv, p. 619 *b;* to Cos, see Herond. *Mim.* ii. 48; and to Mazaca in Cappadocia, see Strab. xii, p. 540 C.

the sale of certain objects, shows decided resemblance to an analogous Roman disposition.[1]

At any rate, there took place in Magna Graecia, if not the first, certainly the most important, codification of the classic world, and one which embraced more than the views and experience of a single city or of a single people. In that region was practically begun the movement of universal codification which was later to become the object of the studies of Plato, Aristotle, Theophrastus, and Callimachus, and which formed the base of the *ius gentium* and the *ius naturale*, which some still wrongly think are the result of the juridical knowledge of the Romans alone.[2]

The fragments of the code of Thurii which is attributed to Charondas call our attention to two facts. In the first place, we learn that the legislation of the Twelve Tables was not in harmony with the national character of the Romans, if, as it seems, it differed from that which previously was in force in such particulars as those pertaining to the law of obligations and to the protection of orphans. In addition, it is clear that the laws of the Italiot cities represent a much more advanced stage of civilization than the Roman people had as yet attained.

A detailed comparison between the features of private right in the code of Charondas and in Roman legislation would require more space than the present volume admits. Awaiting the fuller treatment which I hope to give the subject, I here limit my justification of the statement to a reference to the legislative dispositions of the two peoples in regard to educational matters. Ancient writers attest the difficulty experienced in introducing the study of grammar and rhetoric at Rome. It will suffice for our purpose to refer to the *senatus consulta* of 161 and of 92 B. C., which decreed the expulsion from Rome of Greek philosophers and Latin rhetori-

[1] Theophr. apud Stob. *Flor.* xliv. 22; cf. Hoffmann, *Beiträge zur Geschichte d. griech. und röm. Recht* (Vienna, 1870).

[2] Also in this connection it is probable that Greece was preceded by the oriental monarchies, just as she was anticipated by Egypt in regard to various features of the penal code. In the same way there may some day be found something of truth in that which was attributed to the humane King Bocchoris (734–729 B. C.?); see Diod. i. 65.

cians. We may also recall how the education of children was intrusted to slaves, and how during the last two centuries of the Republic only a few of the wealthiest and most powerful Romans sought to have teachers, to whom were intrusted not only their own children, but also those of their friends.[1] The institution of municipal schools proper, on Roman soil, is, as is known, the result of the policy of Caesar and of the Empire.

In this respect also the life of the Greeks was far different, and we learn from Herodotus that a public school existed at Chios at the beginning of the fifth century B. C.[2] Moreover, that the same conditions of culture existed in the cities of Magna Graecia and Sicily, where philosophers of the Pythagorean school were allowed to take part in the government of the state, and where scientists such as Pythagoras and Empedocles could control the destinies of Croton, of Metapontum, and of Agrigentum, is shown by one of the best dispositions of the laws of Thurii which are attributed to Charondas, in which is imposed upon parents the obligation of having their children instructed.[3] Thus compulsory public instruction was recognized on the classic soil of Magna Graecia, at a time when the Greeks, regarding with disdain the indigenous peoples of the peninsula who were far behind them in culture, called the Etruscans and Romans barbarians. Without doubt, whatever

[1] See Suet. *De gramm.* i ff.; *De rhetor.* i ff.; cf. Marquardt, *Röm Staatsverw.*, IV, p. 95. We are also informed by ancient writers of the miserable condition of teachers up to the beginning of the Empire. As an example of this, see the inscription of the Ausonian teacher Furius Philocalus, who died at Capua, and who, to make a living, followed the profession of notary as well (*CIL*, X, 3969). Vespasian was the first to establish honorary stipends for professors (Suet. *Vesp.* 18). It is a question whether from this we may conclude, as does Marquardt (*op. cit.*, II², p. 107; cf. the material in Liebenam, *Städteverw. im röm. Kaiserreich* [Leipzig, 1900], p. 76), that official instruction was then introduced in Rome for the first time, or whether the *annua centana* for the payment of instructors was then first established. Certainly the plans of Caesar embraced the protection of teachers of the liberal arts; Suet. *Caes.* 42: "omnisque medicinam Romae professos et liberalium artium doctores quo libentius et ipsi urbem incolerent et ceteri adpeterent, civitate donavit."

[2] Herodot. vi. 27.

[3] Diod. xii. 12. 5: *ἐνομοθέτησε γὰρ τῶν πολιτῶν τοὺς υἱεῖς ἅπαντας μανθάνειν γράμματα, χορηγούσες τῆς πόλεως τοὺς μισθοὺς τοῖς διδασκάλοις.*

impulses for the study of the arts and sciences came to the Romans and Etruscans must have been received from Magna Graecia and Sicily. It was not by mere chance that Aristoxenus of Tarentum, the well-known follower of Aristotle, was the first to say that the Messapians, Lucanians and Romans sent disciples to Pythagoras.[1] With this statement is evidently connected the ancient Roman official tradition that King Numa was a pupil of the philosopher of Samos.

An examination of all the literary and moral impulses which came from Magna Graecia and Sicily to Latium would, on the one hand, lead to a repetition of some of the observations which I have elsewhere had occasion to make, and, on the other, would oblige me against my will to treat the subject far too hastily.[2] It will therefore be permitted me, in conclusion, to give only as much as a brief but accurate investigation of the facts will allow.

First should be considered the religions and cults which, even before the influence of literature properly speaking, prepared the Romans for the reception of foreign learning. Just as the cults of Demeter and Mercury seem to have brought to Rome the legends concerning Menenius Agrippa, Sp. Melius, and other well-deserving patrons of the plebs when oppressed by famine, so the cults of Diana, of Castor and Pollux, and of Diomede, coming from the Chalcidian cities of Sicily and Magna Graecia, or spreading from Apulia and the neighboring regions, favored the diffusion of those sacred tales which received literary form in the manifold myths relating to Ulysses and Aeneas, and to the story of the battle of Lake Regillus.[3] The cult of Aphrodite

[1] Aristox., fr. 5 M.: *προσῆλθον δ' αὐτῷ* [i. e., to Pythagoras] *ὥς φησιν Ἀριστόξενος καὶ Λευκανοὶ καὶ Μεσσάπιοι καὶ Πευκέτιοι καὶ Ῥωμαῖοι.* With all due respect for Rohde (*Rhein. Mus.*, XXVII [1872], p. 57), this passage has hitherto been misunderstood. For its correct interpretation see my *Storia di Roma*, I, 1, p. 384. With the above reference is connected, it seems to me, the allusion to the wisdom of Pontius Telesinus, who is said to have heard Archytas and Plato at Tarentum; cf. *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, p. 678.

[2] See my *Storia di Roma*, I, 1, chap. i.

[3] See the preceding chapter for the influence of the cults from Sicily. In the case of Castor and Pollux it is enough to recall that the legend concerning their appearance at the battle of the Sagras was also localized at Cyrene and Agrigen-

Victrix possibly came to Rome from Thurii, and from Tarentum that of Dis, which was connected with the secular games. From Cumae certainly came the cult of Apollo, as is evident from the tale of the Sibyl who gave the Sibylline books to Tarquinius.[1]

tum. It is intimately connected with the introduction into various regions of the cults of these divinities. See the passages quoted in Preller, *Griech. Myth.*, II3, pp. 99 ff. For this cult at Tusculum, see Albert, *Le culte de Castor et Pollux en Italie* (Paris, 1883).

We find the cult of Diomede at Lavinium (App. *B. C.* ii. 20; Serv. ad *Aen.* viii. 9); see my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, p. 702, for its connection with the Roman myths.

Among the many cults which came from southern Italy to Latium should also be mentioned that of the Argive Juno. According to Aelian *N. A.* xi. 16, the Juno worshiped at Lanuvium was the Argive Hera (cf. Prop. iv. 8). It is obvious that she was introduced through the agency of the Greeks, who held in special reverence the temple of Argive Juno at the mouth of the Silarus (Strab. v, p. 252 C.; Plin. *N. H.* iii. 70; and see above, p. 315, note 5). In other words, this cult came from Posidonia, whence it also seems to have spread into the neighboring Campania (see the type of coins of the Campanian Hyria; Head, *Hist. num.*, 32). The cult of Argive Juno is also found at Tibur (*CIL*, XIV, 3556), and may well have been brought there at a fairly early period, since the early legends (see Cat. et Sext. apud Sol. ii. 8; Verg. *Aen.* vii. 670 ff.; Hor. *Carm.* ii. 6. 5) make Tibur of Argive origin.

That the cult of Diana on the Aventine should be connected with that of Phocaea and Velia is evident from the words of Strabo (vi, p. 280 C.), who says that the statue of the Aventine Diana was similar to that of the Diana of Marseilles. It is merely a question whether this cult was brought directly to Rome, as one would think from the more or less mythical account of Trogus Pompeius (see Iust. xlii. 3. 4), or by way of Aricia. This latter hypothesis seems the more reasonable on account of the connection of the cult of Servius Tullius with the Lake of Aricia. From Aricia also came to Rome (Hyin. *Fab.* 250; Serv. ad *Aen.* ii. 116) the cult of Orestes, which was closely connected with that of Diana of Phaselis, and was held in honor among the Chalcidians of Messina and Regium. From these passages we likewise learn that the reputed ashes of Orestes were interred in the temple of Saturn in the Forum. And since this temple, according to the most credible Roman tradition, was founded in the second half of the fourth century (see above, p. 313, note 1), it follows that we have an allusion to the cults which came from Aricia to Rome after 338 B. C. (see Liv. viii. 14. 3).

In connection with the cult of Diana, attention might be called to the archaic relief found near Aricia; cf. Overbeck, *Gesch. d. griech. Plastik*, I, p. 216; Sittl, *Archeologie d. Kunst*, p. 627.

[1] For the cult of Tarentum and of Dis localized at the *Tarentum* or *Terentum*, see my *Storia di Roma*, I, 1, chaps. iii, iv. Without doubt the account of Val. Max. ii. 3. 5 alludes to Tarentum, and we must reject the hypothesis of Preller-Jordan (*Röm. Myth.*, II3, p. 82) that *Tarentum* is derived from the Sabine *terenum* ="soft" or "moist." Certain ancient writers are also wrong, it seems to me, in

The same is true in the case of the cult of Hercules. There are two opinions concerning the origin of this cult. Although most critics agree in thinking the Latino-Sabine Hercules merely a repetition of the Greek Heracles, who in turn found his prototype in eastern religions, others, as is well known, think that Hercules was an indigenous divinity who from the beginning had nothing in common with the Greek god, with whom he was not confused till a later period. To me the former theory seems preferable, although it makes little difference for our present purpose which is accepted. I wish merely to recall that the myth of Cacus, as connected with that of Hercules, is the well-known legend of Geryon as sung by Stesichorus, and localized along the shores of Magna Graecia at Pandosia, Croton, and Regium, and especially at Herculaneum in Campania, at Naples, and at Baiae, where is still shown the road, near Lake Lucrinus, which is said to have been made by the hero, and which is the oldest road in Italy. Certainly the annalist Gellius made Cacus come to Rome from Campania; and the bronze bull, and the other monuments near the Porta Trigemina recalling this hero and his slayer Hercules, are found precisely at the spot where the road which led from Rome to Capua commenced.[1]

explaining *Tarentum* as *quod ripas terat* (Serv. ad *Aen.* xiii. 63). Without hesitation I connect the Tarentine games with the image of the Tarentine Europa (see Babelon, *op. cit.*, II, p. 519; cf. the coin of the Volteii, *ibid.*, p. 568; see above, p. 317, note 2), and also with the myth concerning the forming of the island in the Tiber from the crops from the land of the Tarquins, consecrated to the gods of the lower world (cf. Liv. ii. 5).

We have a reference to the cults which came to Rome from the neighboring Thurii in the legendary account of Pseud.-Plut. *Parall.* 37. But the passage is more than doubtful, and it is not certain, as I have conjectured (*Storia di Roma*, I, 2, p. 499), that Τούξιον should be corrected to Θούριον. From a paleographical standpoint the change from one form to the other may be explained as an error derived from a poor reproduction of the Latin form *Thurium*.

For the introduction of the cult of Apollo to Rome, see my *Storia di Roma*, I, 1, p. 349.

[1] Gell. apud Sol. i. 8=fr. 7* P.: "unde venerat redux, praesidiis amplioribus occupato circa Vulturnum et Campanian regno . . . ." I have attempted to prove in my *Storia di Roma* (I, 2, pp. 439, 560) that the cult of Hercules in Rome should be connected with the censorship of Appius Claudius Caecus and the Via Appia, and also with the conquest of Campania and Samnium. Not merely at Rome,

The rapid decline of Italiot civilization caused by the Sabine invasions interrupted for a certain number of years, and transformed, if it did not destroy, those relations with Latium and Rome

but in the West in general, along the shores of the Ionian Sea, near the Lucrine Lake, in Campania, among the Graian Alps, and in the Pyrenees, the myth of Hercules was connected with the security of the roads.

Without doubt, what has been attributed to the Roman Hercules in regard to Cacus, as has often been observed, is merely a localization of the myth of Geryon, of Croton, and of all the other monsters and local heroes whom Hercules is said to have slain. The opinion of Bréal, that the myth of Hercules and Cacus contains a naturalistic element which also appears in the Vedic myth of Indra and Vritra, does not imply that such a content is excluded from the legend of Geryon as told by Stesichorus. Indeed, everything favors the contrary supposition. It is also probable that in the final analysis the accounts pertaining to Hercules and Heracles may be identified with those regarding the Chaldean Izdubar.

I confess I cannot understand the objections of certain linguists to the identification of the Greek Heracles with the Latin Hercules, since the latter name is nothing but the Greek form adapted to the exigencies of the Latin language. There is the same relation between the name of the Graeco-Campanian city *Heracleion* and *Herculaneum*, the name which was given it by the Romans.

The fact that the name "Hercules" is a Roman transcription of the Greek form "Heracles" does not prove that there was not a cult of Italic origin which was fused with that of the Greek hero. In fact, *Hercules* stands in the same relation to *Semo Sanctus* and to *Dius Fidius* as *Ceres* stands to *Demeter;* with this difference, however, that in the case of Ceres the name of the divinity remained indigenous, although she was worshiped according to Greek rites; whereas in the case of Hercules both the name and the cult remained Greek. It seems possible to explain this by considering that the cult of Hercules, just as that of Apollo, Aesculapius, etc., was introduced into Rome at a time when Greek culture was meeting with general acceptance. On the other hand, the cults of Saturn, Ceres, Diana, and Venus, which preserved the indigenous names, point to an older period in which the rites alone were introduced, and connected with existing deities.

The failure to recognize the true character of the Graeco-Latin Heracles-Hercules has been caused in part by the exaggerations in the theory of Bréal, and also by the statements of Reifferscheid, who, in describing the deeds of the Italic divinity, did not take into consideration that possibly among the Greek legends of Heracles which in the course of time came to be regarded as secondary, there may be analogies to those connected with the Latin hero. To Hercules, moreover, may also be attributed the deeds of the ancient Semo Sanctus, with whom, ancient writers tell us, the Greek Heracles was identified, although this had no connection with the derivation of one name from the other. Be that as it may, the Greek character of the cult of Hercules is constantly affirmed by the ancient Romans, who recognized in him a Greek god (Liv. i. 15), and who, because of this cult, termed Rome a Greek city. See Strabo (v, p. 230 C.), who refers to the annalist Acilius (or Caelius ?). In spite of all this, the very ones who claim to adhere to the authority of Livy and tradition, deny the identification Heracles=Hercules.

which must have commenced as early, at least, as the end of the seventh century B. C. The result of this was the favoring of the relations of the Etruscans, Latins, and Oscans with the cities of Sicily, especially Syracuse, which derived much profit from this state of affairs.

Tradition is in general silent in regard to the importance of these earliest relations between Rome and the Italiots. We are not always in a position to determine whether some of those which we have noted were due to the influence of poets who continued the work of Stesichorus, and of historians such as Hippys, who derived their origin from Chalcidian Regium, or whether we should not regard them as the result of traditions current among writers of Tarentum and the Messapian peninsula at the time of the first Samnite wars, from Aristoxenus down to Livius Andronicus, Ennius, and Pacuvius.

Ample and carefully conducted excavations, not at Rome alone, but throughout the Latin plain and the Volscian territory—regions which promise a rich archaeological harvest—may make possible, if not the solution, at least the better formulation, of this problem, viz.: Was there, even if to a lesser degree, an intellectual influence in the field of religion and art, corresponding to the important commercial relations which existed with the Italiot cities, and especially with Chalcidian Regium, Cumae, and Phocaean Velia? We already know that Rome had occupied the attention of the historians of Syracuse and Sicily, from Antiochus, Philistus, and Callias, to Timaeus, Philinus of Agrigentum, and Silenus of Calacte. Certainly strong Italiot influence was felt after the commencement of relations with the Samnites and Tarentum. From Tarentum, thanks to Livy, Ennius and Pacuvius, there spread to Rome the branches of literature most diffused among the Italiots, and also the Pythagorean doctrines, of which Appius Claudius, the censor of 312 B. C., is said to have been a follower. From Tarentum came to Rome that Ennius who revealed the scientific results and the philosophical speculations of the Siceliots. Leaving aside the poem on the ἡδυπάθεια, which seems to be a reproduction of that of Archestratus of Gela, Ennius

popularized among the Latins the doctrines of Epicharmus, and also those of Euhemerus of Messina, destined to exercise great influence on Roman religion, philosophy, and historiography. It will suffice to recall Picus and Lupa, the nurse of Romulus, two sacred animals, and protectors of the Latin race, which were transformed into human beings by the earliest Latin annalists.[1]

In the midst of this tangled maze of Greek currents which preceded the period of greater influence directly from Athens, Alexandria, and Pergamum, special attention should be called to one particular region of the peninsula for the importance of the part it played in the education of the future rulers of the world. I allude to Campania, which never ceased to be an important center of culture and civilization, even after it came into the hands of the Samnites, who themselves became famous under the name of Campanians, and who seized Cumae, Nola, and Pompeii, and founded Nuceria. I shall elsewhere treat of the importance of the relations between Naples and Capua, and between Naples, Tarentum, and Thurii, for the later development of Oscan culture, and the production of that peculiar literary product termed Atellan, which became exceptionally popular at Rome, and which seems to have some connection with the φλύακες which the Tarentines received with great favor, and which, in the last analysis, find a precedent in the Sicilian literary productions of the fifth century.

It was in Campania that authors whose names we are unable to give, told those adventures of Aristodemus of Cumae which furnish us the first glimpses of a political history of Rome.[2] In Campania possibly lived the author of the history of Cumae which narrated the mythical deeds of the seven kings, and the

[1] I allude to well-known facts which I have brought out elsewhere in publications to which I have made frequent reference in this article. It might also be noted in this connection that the myth of Anna, sister of Dido, which was later fused with that of Anna Perenna, contains elements which are easily understood if we think of an earlier localization of the legend of Aeneas on the shores of Thurii (see Ovid *Fast.* iii. 585). This is not surprising, since also the myth of Aeneas and the Trojans received localization in the region of Thurii and the neighboring cities (Schol. Lycophr. apud Serv. ad Verg. *Georg.* i. 103=Claud., fr. 91 P.).

[2] Diod. vii. 10; Dion. Hal. vii. 2 f.; Plut *De mul. virt.* 26.

arrival in Rome of the Sibyl.[1] And, finally, Rome is indebted to Campania for the Naevius who, in describing the First Punic War, took occasion to introduce all of the myths bearing on the origin of Campania and Latium, and who, in creating Roman tragedy, set forth the deeds of the founder of the city. But while Samnite Campania gave to Rome the first author of a national epic, Greek Naples, the faithful ally of the Romans, produced the Eumachus who narrated the Second Punic War and the struggle of Rome against Hannibal.[2] Were the Fates more kind, it might be possible to establish that more than one of the passages in Livy relating to the wars against the Samnites, or to the taking of Naples in 326 B. C., were derived from some historian who was born, or who lived, either near or in Naples.[3] It was probably also some historian of Naples, or of the neighboring Cumae, who was drawn upon by Lutatius when the latter wrote the history of Naples.[4] It is obvious that Naples, the most advanced city of Italy at the end of the Republic and the beginning of the Empire, did not rise to such a degree of civilization through the aid and favor of the Romans, but that she had followed along the line of the noble traditions which date from the second half of the fifth century, or the time when Cumae and Athens called her into being.[5]

The various cities of Magna Graecia and Sicily exercised an enormous influence, both material and political, religious and literary, on the Roman people between the seventh and third

[1] Müller, *F. H. G.*, IV, p. 434; cf. Maas, *De Sibyllarum indicibus* (Gryphiswaldiae, 1879).

[2] Müller, *op. cit.*, III, p. 102.

[3] Also on this occasion I may be permitted to refer to my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, pp. 487 ff., where I have attempted to show that the detailed accounts of Livy and Dionysius concerning the conquest of Naples and the relations of that city with Tarentum deserve credence, and are not, as Niese and other German scholars have thought late creations of the Roman annalist.

[4] The precious fragment of Lutatius apud Philarg. in Verg. *Georg.* iv. 564= fr. 2 P., relating to the origin of Naples as succeeding Parthenope, is fully understood when we recall the villa of the Lutatii Catuli at Baiae, and their habit of living in Campania, since it was from there that they introduced the *velaria* into Rome (Val. Max. ii. 3. 6; cf. Plin. *N. H.* xix. 23).

[5] In a special article I hope shortly to treat of the time when Naples, having lost all political importance, became exclusively the home of the Muses.

centuries B. C. If Roman tradition insists but little on this fact, and is more eager to show that Greece properly speaking, and the Hellenistic kingdoms, were her masters in the arts and sciences, this is explained by the fact that not until the third century did Rome spread beyond the confines of the peninsula, to become the foremost political state of the world, and to enter upon extended political relations with the Greek countries.[1] This took place when the Alexandrian and Pergamenean civilizations were in full flower. The brilliant memories of Athens were, in part at least, unforgotten, but the civilization of Pergamum and Alexandria represented really a further refinement, and as a living force exercised such fascination over the Romans as to force into the background, if not into oblivion, the remembrance of how much they had learned from the Italiots and Siceliots. This was favored both by the economic and political decadence of the greater portion of the cities of Magna Graecia, and by the ever-increasing political relations between Rome and the eastern countries. Thus the Romans acted after the manner of those who give all the credit to the clever and famous teachers of the final years of their scientific education, and forget the humble instructors who gave them the first, and possibly the most important, impulses toward forming their minds.

The Romans at the time of Caesar and Augustus, when considering the invasion of Hellenic culture which took place after the victories of Titus Quintius Flaminius and Paulus Aemilius, and which made Roman civilization worthy of being compared with that of Greece, were naturally led to exclaim:

> Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit, et artes
> Intulit agresti Latio.[2]

But if Roman writers had united a sense of complete objectivity with a full knowledge of the vicissitudes of their national history, they would have expressed themselves differently. In the work in which Cicero, following, as he himself says, Greek authors, traces the first beginnings of the Roman people, there is certainly

[1] The comparatively recent origin of the direct political relations between Rome and Greece is explicitly affirmed by Polybius (ii. 12), who gives the date as 228 B. C.

[2] Hor. *Ep.* ii. 1. 156.

a partial exaggeration where we read that, at the time of Tarquinius Priscus, to the city "influxit non tenuis e Graecia rivulus, sed abondantissimus amnis illarum disciplinarium et artium."[1] At the beginning of the sixth century Rome was by no means fully acquainted with the science and culture of Greece. So true was this, indeed, that it was not until the following century, according to Varro, that she shook off the influence of Etruscan art sufficiently to build a temple in the Greek style.[2] However, the archaic pottery found on Faliscan territory and in the recent excavations in the Forum proves, if such a thing is necessary, that in the fifth century Rome was open to the vivifying influence of Magna Graecia, Sicily, and Phocaean Marseilles. The recent excavations in the Forum, which do not weaken, as has erroneously been stated, but rather confirm, the results of historical criticism, show the error of certain modern critics who have doubted the accuracy of the tradition which speaks of the relations of the Romans with the Liparaeans and the oracle at Delphi, about the end of the fifth century B. C.[3] It was because the Romans from this time on were in commercial relations with the Greeks that they refrained from molesting the Greek ships, as did the inhabitants of Antium; and, just as the Etruscans of neighboring Caere, they protected the Greek mercantile marine, and sent treasures to Delphi.[4] Thus it was natural that Antiochus of Syracuse, and later Aristotle, Heraclides Ponticus, and Theophrastus, should have treated of Rome in a friendly spirit.[5] And it was also natural that the city which received on its hospitable shores and at its favorable markets the Greek merchants, should have received from the writers of Greece proper, from the fourth century on, the well-deserved title of πόλις Ἑλληνίς.[6]

[1] Cic. *De re publ.* ii. 32.

[2] Varr. apud Plin. *N. H.* xxxv. 154; cf. Vitruv. iii. 2. 27.

[3] For the embassy of the Romans to Delphi and their relations with the Liparaeans, wrongly denied by some writers, see my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, p. 26.

[4] Strab. v, p. 221 C.; p. 232 C.; cf. Diod. xv. 1. 82; also chap. xxii, below.

[5] See the preceding chapter.

[6] Heracl. Pont. apud Plut. *Cam.* 22. 2; cf. Strab. v, pp. 231 C. ff.

XXII

THE GREEK FLEET WHICH APPEARED OFF THE COAST OF LATIUM IN 349 B. C.

Livy narrates that in 349 B. C. the coast of Latium between Antium and the Tiber was infested with Greek pirates, who, having landed on the shore, contended with the Gauls who had come down from the Alban Hills and were likewise devastating the Latin plain. Camillus, the son of the celebrated preserver of Rome, moved against the Gauls, and intrusted to the praetor the task of defending the coast against the pirates. Livy concludes his account as follows:

Cum Graecis a Camillo nulla memorabilis gesta res: nec illi terra, nec Romanus mari bellator erat. postremo cum litoribus arcerentur, aqua etiam praeter cetera necessaria usui deficiente, Italiam reliquere. cuius populi ea cuiusque gentis classis fuerit nihil certi est. Maxime Siciliae fuisse tyrannos crediderim; nam ulterior Graecia ea tempestate intestino fessa bello iam Macedonum opes horrebat.[1]

Niebuhr thinks the opinion of Livy that these marauders came from Sicily is without foundation, and suspects that they were a portion of the mercenaries who, when the Sacred War of 346 B. C. was ended, abandoned Greece under the leadership of the Phocaean Phalaecus. It was not Phalaecus who came to Italy, says Niebuhr, but the Spartan king Archidamus with the remnant of his mercenaries; and possibly these were the marauders who, before they had found regular service, laid waste the coast of Latium. If they were on ships from any special place, this could only have been from Tarentum.[2]

The opinion of Niebuhr has recently been opposed by Holzapfel, who maintains that we have here to do with a synchronism, and that the year 448 of Varro corresponds to 443–442—the year when Dionysius II abandoned Syracuse forever. According to

[1] Liv. vii. 26. 13; cf. 25. 1, 12.

[2] Niebuhr, *Röm. Geschichte*, I, p. 99=ed. Isler, p. 75.

Holzapfel, the freebooters who came to Latium were the mercenaries of the tyrant, who found themselves obliged after his downfall to seek their living in another manner.[1]

Although it is impossible to obtain a definite answer to the problem, I shall attempt in the following pages to show the falsity of the theory of Holzapfel, and to present several passages bearing on this question which, so far as I know, have not as yet been considered in this connection, and which in part tend to disprove, though in part also corroborating, the hypothesis advanced by Niebuhr.

Let us commence with the theory of Holzapfel. It is expressly attested that, when the Corinthian Timoleon arrived at Syracuse, Dionysius II gave over to him not only the fortress and munitions of war, but even the two thousand mercenaries whom he had at his disposal.[2] Timoleon, as we shortly shall have occasion to repeat, arrived in Sicily with but a small force, and made use of all the soldiers and of all the means which he could find. The facility with which, as soon as he had arrived, he received those who came to him from Italy and Sicily,[3] and also those for whom he had sent to Greece, the islands of the Aegean, and the coast of Asia Minor, together with the liberality he displayed in awarding Syracusan citizenship to all who desired it, proves that, instead of fleeing from Sicily, Greeks of no matter what condition had every reason for hastening thither.

Modern writers hold that Livy hazarded on his own account the conjecture that the Greek marauders were sent by the Sicilian tyrants; but they are wrong in asserting this with such positiveness. One may with equal reason suppose that Livy found this question already discussed in the Roman annals which served him as source. This being admitted, the fact that he says the pirates could not have come from Greece proper—*ulterior Graecia* is evidently in apposition to *Magna Graecia*—causes one to suspect that

[1] Holzapfel, *Röm. Chronologie*, p. 124.

[2] Plut. *Timol.* 13. 5: *στρατιῶται δὲ δισχίλιοι τῷ Διονυσίῳ παρῆσαν οὓς ἐκεῖνος, ὡς τἄλλα τῷ Τιμολέοντι παρέδωκεν.*

[3] Liv. x. 2.

some Roman writer had thought of the arrival in Latium of the mercenaries of the Phocaean war. Be that as it may, the reason for the uncertainty should be sought, in all probability, in the silence of the Greeks regarding an insignificant band of pirates, and possibly also in the chronological disorder in which the Romans became involved when, on the basis of a false synchronism, they corrupted their chronology and were lost in the maze of varying and often apocryphal evidence which their annalists offered.

Niebuhr thinks Livy mistaken in his supposition regarding the Sicilian tyrants, and holds that the Siceliots, who were disunited and without ships, were in no position to attempt similar maritime undertakings. But even in the present case Niebuhr speaks too positively. Our information concerning the state of Sicily for the years preceding the arrival of Timoleon is very vague. Diodorus, with his customary negligence, says not a word concerning the history of his native land for the year 355 B. C. For the year 354 he says merely that when Dion was killed he was succeeded by Callippus for thirteen months;[1] for 353, that Callippus sought shelter in Leontini, and that Hipparinus, the son of Dionysius, regained Syracuse and held it for two years;[2] for 351, that Leptines and Callippus seized Regium from Dionysius;[3] for 350–349 he is silent; and for 346 he records merely that the Syracusans were oppressed by many tyrants.[4] From the life of Timoleon, however, as told by Plutarch and Diodorus, we learn that almost every city—such as Catana, Tauromenium, Centuripa, Leontini, Engyum, and Messana—had its own tyrant, and we are also certain that they relied on the power of Carthage. At about the same time the Italiots were oppressed by the Bruttians, who, profiting by the decay of the Italiot cities after the fall of the empire of Dionysius II, in the year following that of the revolution of Dion (356) assailed several of these cities.[5] It is no wonder, then,

[1] Diod. xvi. 31. [2] Diod. xvi. 36. [3] Diod. xvi. 45. [4] Diod. xvi. 68.

[5] Diod. xvi. 15. That the uprising of the Bruttians is closely connected with the revolution of Dion and the history of Syracuse not only appears from these chronological data, but is expressly stated by Strab. vi, p. 255 C. The alliance of Timoleon with Regium, the enemy of Syracuse, is explained by the fact that part of the inhabitants of Regium were descended from the Syracusan colonists placed

that Livy, or his source, should have had the Sicilian tyrants in mind. For the same reasons which at that time led many Syracusans to seek refuge in the islands of the Aegean and on the coast of Asia,[1] other Italiots and Siceliots, without going so far from their native land, evaded the pursuing Carthaginians who were protecting their tyrants, by withdrawing to the neighboring shores of central Italy, shores with which for centuries they had had commercial relations. Between 345 and 340 there came to Timoleon exiles from Italy as well as from Sicily, who asked and obtained a permanent home on the island.

For chronological reasons which will shortly be considered, there seems to attach just as much probability to the theory opposing that of Livy as to the one that he accepts. It is, however, most natural that Livy, or his source, should have had Sicily in mind, since from the beginning of the fifth to the middle of the fourth century it influenced the coast of Latium to a remarkable extent, both politically and commercially, and since nearly all of the synchronisms which he and his sources register, refer to that island.[2]

Let us now examine the opinion of Niehubr. For the sake of clearness, let us recall that, at the end of the Sacred War, Phalaecus, the son of Phayllus and the nephew of Philomelus and Onomarchus, the former leaders of the Phocaeans in that war, when he saw that he could not oppose Philip of Macedon, obtained permission to depart with his eight thousand mercenaries and proceed wherever he wished. He went first to the Peloponnese and, having

there by Dionysius I. Likewise, the assistance which was given to Thurii by the Corinthians sent to Syracuse and Timoleon (see Plut. *Timol.* 16, 19) is explained by the fact that Syracuse had made herself arbiter of the affairs of Italy after the battle of the Helorus (389 B. C.) and the conquest of Regium (387) and Croton (379).

[1] Plutarch (*Timol.* 23) uses the term πλεῖστοι of those who betook themselves to the islands of the Aegean and the coast of Asia Minor. Among them were those who followed Megillus, Pheristus, and Gorgo, the recent founders of Gela and Agrigentum. In the passage where we read (*ibid.* 35), τὴν μὲν οἱ περὶ Μέγελλον καὶ Φέριστον ἐξ Ἐλέας τὴν δὲ οἱ περὶ Γόργον ἐκ Κέω, I would correct to ἐξ Ἠλείας and ἐκ Κῶ. It has hitherto escaped notice that Μέγελλος is not an unknown individual, but is the well-known Spartan Μεγίλλος, one of the characters in the Νόμοι of Plato, who was also at Tarentum, and who together with Clinias is said to have founded a colony at Magnesia (Plat. *Leg.* i. 624; Cic. *D. L.* i. 15).

[2] See above, p. 296.

arrived at Corinth, embarked with his men for the shores of Italy and Sicily, hoping either to procure some rule for himself, or else to be employed in some undertaking. According to Diodorus, whom we have so far followed, he counted on the war which was then being waged between the Tarentines and Lucanians, but gave his soldiers to understand that he was invited by certain individuals in Italy and Sicily. They, however, perceived the vanity of his promises, and, not wishing to undertake so long a voyage without the assurance of certain recompense, compelled him to put the ships about and return toward the Peloponnese. While at Cape Malea on his way thither he received an invitation from the Cnossians, who were contending with the Lyttians, and, going to Crete, captured Lyttus. The Lyttians, as we know from other sources,[1] were Spartan colonists, and on that account demanded aid from the Spartans, who were just then preparing to go to the assistance of their colony, Tarentum. The Spartan king, Archidamus, therefore suspended his other preparations and, going to their aid, defeated Phalaecus, who remained thenceforth in Crete, and later perished in the siege of Cydonia. On the other hand, the mercenaries of Phalaecus returned to the Peloponnese, where most of them were killed by the Arcadians and Elaeans. Archidamus proceeded to Italy and reached Tarentum the same year in which the Sacred War ended (346 B. C.). Seven years later, while fighting against the Lucanians, he perished at Manduria, on the same day and in the same hour, according to ancient writers, that Philip conquered the Athenians at Chaeronea (August 2, 338).[2]

From this narration it by no means results, as Niebuhr asserts, that Archidamus arrived in Italy "with the remnants of the troops of Phalaecus," and much less that these mercenaries were on board Tarentine ships, and laid waste the coast of Latium before being called to Tarentum. From Diodorus we learn instead that Archidamus went from Crete directly to Tarentum, whither indeed he had been bound before he went to the aid of the Lyttians. He and his men had a fixed goal, and had no need of wandering about.

[1] E. g., Polyb. iv. 54. 6.

[2] Diod. xvi. 59 ff., 88; cf. Plut. *Ag.* 3; Theopomp. apud Plin. *N. H.* iii. 98.

It is still less reasonable to suppose that Tarentine ships came to the coast of Latium. Tarentum had too much to look after at home, and in the war with the Lucanians, to trouble herself with uncertain and distant undertakings on the Mediterranean shores, where the Tarentine fleet had never appeared, even though its assistance in the fourth century would have been far from useless. In addition we learn from Diodorus that of the eight thousand mercenaries whom Phalaecus took to the Peloponnese,[1] a large number perished during the siege of Cydonia, which was attacked after the departure of Archidamus from Crete. Of those remaining many died later in the Peloponnese, and those who did not fall on the field of battle, to the number of four thousand, were there put to death.[2] Nevertheless, we know that Archidamus had aided Phalaecus and the Phocaeans,[3] and the source of Diodorus regarded as an instance of divine vengeance the fact that Archidamus and his followers, who had borne aid to the Tarentines, were slaughtered by the Lucanians, since both he and his men had been guilty of sacrilege in despoiling the temple at Delphi.[4] But even from these statements it does not appear that Archidamus had hired mercenaries from Phalaecus before going to Crete. The words of Diodorus may refer to the thousand Spartans who in the tenth and last year of the Phocaean war aided Phalaecus and the Phocaeans under the leadership of the same Archidamus.[5]

However, in spite of the report that the mercenaries of Phalaecus compelled their leader to turn the ships back toward the Peloponnese, I believe it can be shown with certainty that some of those who had fought under Philomelus, Onomarchus, Phayllus, and Phalaecus really came to Italy. Theopompus, who, be it said in passing, was the primary source, whether direct or indirect, of Diodorus for the above-mentioned details, in relating the story of the hetaerae who were presented by the Phocaean leaders with the votive offerings stolen from the temple at Delphi, states that to the Thessalian dancer Pharsalia, Philomelus gave a wreath of gold,

[1] Diod. xvi. 59.

[2] Diod. xvi. 63.

[3] Diod. xvi. 59.

[4] Diod. xvi. 63.

[5] Diod. xvi. 59.

a votive offering of the Lampsaceni. This proved to be displeasing to the gods, and when at a later period she happened to be in the agora of the Metapontini near the temple of Apollo, the priests were seized with a sacred frenzy and tore her to pieces.[1] The same event is narrated by Plutarch, whose account differs merely in unimportant particulars, saying that she was slaughtered by the youths of Metapontum, who vied with one another in tearing from her the golden wreath which had been an offering of the Cnidians.[2]

That this was not an isolated case, and that other Phocaeans came to Italy at the same time, is made evident by the story of Timoleon. When, in the year in which the Phocaean war ended, Timoleon accepted the invitation of the Syracusans and decided to free that city from the tyrants (346 B. C.), for lack of anything better, and because his undertaking seemed desperate and no one wished to follow him, he enrolled as mercenaries some of the soldiers who had taken part in the Phocaean war and plundered the temple at Delphi, and were then roaming through the Peloponnese.[3] There is nothing strange in the conduct of Timoleon in this instance. His fellow-citizens had openly favored the Phocaeans,[4] and they had permitted Phalaecus to embark from their port when he was planning to go to Italy.[5] Moreover, political necessity left no room for scruples, and Timoleon frankly made use of these men. We know from Plutarch and Diodorus that he had them with him in the battle of the Crimisus,[6] and Plutarch even affirms that he made use of them in various undertakings, and that over four hundred of those whom he brought with him from Corinth were put to death after the victory of the Crimisus (340 B. C.).[7] These two historians also agree that Timoleon drove certain of his followers from Syracuse after his victory over the Carthaginians, and that these proceeded to the coast of Bruttium, where they attempted to sack a maritime city, but were put to death by the

[1] Theopomp. apud Athen. xiii, 605 *c;* cf. Diod. xvi. 64.

[2] Plut. *De Pyth. orac.* vi, p. 397 *f*.

[3] Plut. *Timol.* 30: *μισούντων δὲ πάντων αὐτοὺς καὶ φυλαττομένων ἐπαράκτους γεγονότας πλανώμενοι περὶ τὴν Πελοπόννησον ὑπὸ Τιμολέοντος ἐλήφθησαν ἑτέρων στρατιωτῶν οὐκ εὐποροῦντος.*

[4] Diod. xvi. 60. 2.

[5] Diod. xvi. 61. 4.

[6] Plut. *Timol.* 25. 4; Diod. xvi. 68. 3.

[7] Plut. *Timol.* 30.

Bruttians.[1] Certainly Timoleon did not drive them out because he had scruples about men who had soiled themselves by taking part in the Sacred War. A good general cares for nothing but courage and discipline in his soldiers. In reality he freed himself from these mercenaries because certain of them, in a mutiny which preceded the battle of the Crimisus, had jeopardized the success of his undertaking. Even after the victory Timoleon continued to make use of part of these Phocaean soldiers, and by the historians whose writings are preserved, and who have presented Timoleon in a false light, depicting him as a hypocrite, it is asserted that in this case also the gods wished to manifest their good-will toward him, and freed him from these men without his incurring the odium of putting them to death.[2]

It is clear, therefore, that certain soldiers and mercenaries from among those who had taken part in the Phocaean war came over to Italy and reached both Tarentum and Sicily, and it remains to discover whether these were the Greeks who in 349 laid waste the coast of the Volscian territory and of Latium. It is, of course, impossible to give a definite answer to this question. When Livy himself writes, "cuius populi ea cuiusque gentis classis fuerit nihil certi est," we who have no access to the primary sources, and who have at our disposal only the few statements preserved by compilers, must of necessity remain uncertain, and can at best only emphasize the probability of the case in question. Unfortunately, the year 349 of Livy does not correspond exactly to the annals of Diodorus. The year 350 of Livy corresponds to 347 of Diodorus,[3] and 348 to 344.[4] But for 349 Livy[5] and the *Fasti Capitolini* have as consuls L. Furius Camillus and Appius Claudius Regillensis, while Diodorus records for the corresponding 346 the consuls M. Aemilius and F. Quinctius.[6] However, for 345,[7] a year which stands midway between the 349 and 348 of Livy, Diodorus records as consuls M. Fabius and Serv. Sulpicius, who are found in the *Fasti Capitolini* and in Livy for the year 345 also. In addition,

[1] Diod. xvi. 82; Plut. *Timol.* 30. 1.
[2] Plut. *Timol.* 30. 4 ff.
[3] Diod. xvi. 56.
[4] Liv. vii. 26; Diod. xvi. 69.
[5] Liv. vii. 24.
[6] Diod. xvi. 59.
[7] Diod. xvi. 66.

in this year 345, corresponding to the 345 of Diodorus, Livy[1] has as dictator the L. Furius Camillus whom in 348 he makes contend as consul against the Greeks. This time, however, he does not fight against them, but only against the Auruncians. It is well known that there is a great deal of duplication in the annals of Livy and in Roman history in general, and that in regard to the Gallic wars, for example, the *fasti* of Diodorus are much less corrupt and more trustworthy. If, in addition to this, we remember that in the account of Livy of the war waged by the consul L. Furius Camillus against the Gauls and Greeks,[2] it is expressly stated that he was not made dictator after the death of his colleague in the consulship, Appius Claudius, it does not seem entirely fortuitous that Diodorus and Livy should in the main agree concerning a year which they both call 345 B. C.

Let us leave this question for the present, since it is connected with numerous other problems pertaining to Roman chronology which cannot be solved here. It is sufficient for our purpose to note that in the year 345 of Diodorus, corresponding to the 349 of Varro and Livy, L. Furius Camillus contended against the Gauls. The best chronology for the Gallic wars is that of Polybius, who places the capture of Rome by the Gauls in 387 B. C. According to this author, the Gauls returned a second time thirty years later, and, when twelve more years had elapsed, for the third time attacked the Romans, who this time proceeded courageously against them and put them to flight.[3] If we subtract 30 plus 12 from 387, we come to the 345 of Diodorus (xiv. 80), who in regard to the chronology of the taking of Rome by the Gauls fol-

[1] Liv. vii. 28.

[2] Thus for the year 359 B. C., Livy (vii. 26) recalls the prowess of Valerius Corvinus against the gigantic Gaul, although he himself (vii 9 ff.) had already narrated the same incident for the year 361 B. C., when the father of Manlius was dictator and C. Sulpicius and C. Licinius were consuls, attributing it to T. Manlius. Moreover, Livy gives us to understand that, according to Claudius Quadrigarius, this remarkable contest was waged by T. Manlius at the time when M. Furius Camillus, the father of our L. Furius, was dictator, in 367 B. C. Livy holds that this occurred "decem haud minus post annos." We should therefore expect the mention of this event after 357, instead of which he speaks of it in 361. In a word, a single deed is said to have been accomplished by two heroes and under two different dictators, and to fall in three separate years, according to three distinct redactions. And yet there are still some among us who call this history!

[3] Polyb. ii. 18. 5 ff.

lows Polybius. Moreover, according to these two authors we must refer to 345 B. C. the victory over the Gauls won by L. Furius Camillus—a victory which is referred by Livy to 349, or the same year in which he says Camillus caused the Greeks to withdraw by sea. If this is admitted, then, since 345 is the year following the end of the Phocaean war, and is also that in which Timoleon arrived in Sicily, it is probable that the Greeks who in that year harassed the shores of Latium and of the Volscians were Phocaean mercenaries, like those who followed Phalaecus, Archidamus, and Timoleon, and sought fortune or safety in the West.

Livy expressly declares that he does not know to what region the Greeks who tried to seize the coast of Latium belonged. This is important, because it shows that the statement was not derived from a Greek source. If some Greek historian had even indirectly recorded the information which we find in Livy, he would certainly have known who these robbers were. The ignorance of Livy, on the other hand, is well explained when we consider that his data were derived from the early Roman annals. It was from the local annals, for instance, that he got his information concerning the arrival of Cleonymus on the shores of Patavium.[1] This ignorance of Greek affairs fits in well with the nature of the Roman annals, which had no horizon beyond that of the regions in which the Romans waged their wars, and which limited themselves to a few inexact synchronisms when they had to deal with events occurring in Sicily and Campania.

In the present instance, however, it is but natural that Greek historians should have neglected to give an account of the insignificant band which sought refuge on a barbarian coast—for such was Latium in the eyes of the Greeks—and Livy is not to be blamed for not knowing the country of marauders such as the Phocaean mercenaries, who were a heterogeneous lot from many cities. Moreover, if the above observations are correct, the statements of Livy in this connection are of the greatest value; for they made possible the discovery of an important synchronism in the history of Rome for the year 345 B. C.

[1] Liv. x. 2.

XXIII

CONCERNING THE EARLY HISTORY OF PISA

There is no doubt that Pisa was once an Etruscan city. In addition to the testimony of Vergil, Strabo, and Pliny,[1] this is made certain by passages from even more ancient authorities. Lycophron, who, as we know, depends upon Timaeus, tells of the arrival of Aeneas at Pisa and of the conquest of that city by the Etruscans.[2] The elder Cato declares that he does not know with certainty what people occupied Pisa before the Etruscans, but, probably on the authority of some ancient Greek writer, asserts that even before the Etruscan Tarchon ruled over Pisa, it was inhabited by a Greek-speaking people.[3] Finally, Polybius,[4] in discussing the extent of the Ligurian territory, says that it extended inland as far as the territory of Arezzo, and along the coast as far as Pisa, which from the point of view of the frontier is called the city *πρώτη . . . . τῆς Τυρρηνίας.*

Notwithstanding these explicit statements, it has been maintained that Pisa was a Ligurian rather than an Etruscan city; and quite recently a young Italian scholar, Dr. Uberto Pedroli, has elaborated certain observations made by E. Bormann,[5] and brought out the following points: (1) that the collector of the *mirabiles auscultationes* places the mouths of the Arno and Auser where Pisa is situated, in the territory of the Ligurians;[6] (2) that

[1] Verg. *Aen.* x. 179; Strab. v, p. 223 C.; Plin. *N. H.* iii. 50.

[2] Lycophr., vss. 1240 ff.; vss. 1335 ff.; cf. Geffcken, *Timaios Geographie des Westens* (Berlin, 1892), pp. 42 ff., 148.

[3] Cat. apud Serv. ad *Aen.* x. 179; cf. Plin., *loc. cit.* The Teutanes *graece loquentes* mentioned by Cato (*loc. cit.*) as the founders of Pisa were possibly the same as the Pelasgians who under the leadership of Teutamides (see Hellen. apud Dion. Hal. i. 28) arrived at the mouth of the Spinetic branch of the Po, and there also founded Cortona.

[4] Polyb. ii. 16. 2.

[5] E. Bormann, in *CIL*, XI, p. 273.

[6] Pseud.-Arist. *De mir. ausc.* 94 (92).

Claudianus places Pisa *in Liguribus;*[1] (3) that until the age of Sulla it would seem that Pisa remained outside the borders of Italy; (4) that, in distinction from the other Etruscan cities, Pisa was attributed to the tribe Galeria, together with the Ligurian Luna, Veleia, and Genua; (5) that it has not been demonstrated that the Etruscan remains found at Pisa really belong to that city. Pedroli concludes with the statement: "One easily sees that the opinion of those who maintain that Pisa was an Etruscan city rests on very slight foundation."[2]

What is the value of these observations? It seems to me that the question has not been properly answered, and that in reality Pisa changed inhabitants at different periods, and from being a Ligurian city was twice included within the bounds of Etruria. It is more than probable that in early times the Ligurians occupied the coast of central Italy at least as far as Rome, in which case Pisa was originally situated in their territory,[3] and we find an explanation for the mention of the Arnus as Λύγγευς by Lycophron.[4] It is clear that the Etruscans, who had not only crossed the Apennines toward the north, but had pushed along the Tyrrhenian coast as far as Luna,[5] also conquered Pisa. This is asserted by both Lycophron and Cato, although the evidence of Lycophron is of less value, as he was speaking of mythological times.[6] Just when the Etruscans succeeded in conquering Pisa it is impossible to state, but it is not true that no traces of such conquest have been found.[7] Certainly the city was Etruscan at the time of Timaeus,

[1] Claud. *De bell. Gild.*, vs. 483. Pedroli might better have attached weight to the statement of Trogus Pompeius apud Iust. xx. 1, 2: "Pisae in Liguribus Graecos habent et in Tuscis Tarquinii."

[2] Pedroli, *Roma e la Gallia Cisalpina* (Turin, 1893), pp. 6 ff.

[3] That the Ligurians pushed as far as Rome was already admitted by Roman writers; see e. g., Dion. Hal. i. 10, 40; Fest., s. v. *Sacrani*, p. 321 M.; cf. also Helbig, *Die Italiker in der Poebene*, pp. 30 ff.

[4] Lycophr., vs. 1240; cf. the comment of E. Ciaceri (Catania, 1901), *ad loc.*

[5] Liv. xli. 13: "et Lunam colonia eodem anno duo millia civium Romanorum sunt deducta . . . . de Liguribus captus ager erat; Etruscorum antea quam Ligurum fuerat."

[6] Lycophr., vss. 1358 ff.

[7] I defer in this to the authority of Professor Gh. Ghirardini ("Scoperte di

the source of Lycophron, in the third century, and it is probable that it became so much earlier, at the time when the Etruscans were masters of the sea in the sixth and fifth centuries. It is also probable that the Etruscans who took from the Ligurians the territory of Pisa, found in that city a Greek commercial factory, probably of the Phocaeans, whom I would identify with the Teutanes or Pelasgians *graece loquentes* of the source of Cato.

I do not intend to examine in detail all the passages relating to the earliest history of Pisa, but since at the present day the existence of a Greek colony at Pisa is generally doubted, I may be permitted to allude briefly to the reasons which lead me to believe that at the confluence of the Arno and Auser there was once a Phocaean factory.

In the comment attributed to Servius it is stated that according to certain authors there was at Pisa a *Phocida oppidum*,[1] and in another place there is a reference to the tradition that Populonia originally belonged to the Corsicans, or, as we should say, to the Phocaeans who founded Aleria[2] in Corsica, and also the Nicaea of that island, which recalls the Massilian Nicaea, wrongly called by Diodorus a colony of the Tyrrhenians.[3] It is true that these statements are derived from a work which in itself is none too authoritative, but they are fully justified when considered from a geographical and political standpoint. It is clear that the Phocaeans, who about 600 founded Marseilles, about 562 occupied the coast of Corsica, and about 542 founded Velia to the south of Campania, must have had occasion to visit the coast of Etruria where Populonia and Pisa were situated. Moreover, the existence of a Greek colony at Pisa is alluded to by Strabo,[4] who says that the Pisans

antichità in Pisa," *Not. d. Scavi* [May, 1892], p. 9), who also informs me of the discovery of an Etruscan tomb of the fifth century B. C. near the Lake of Bientina, between Pisa and Luca, in the region which originally belonged to the territory of Pisa. As we shall see shortly, Pisa gave to the Romans the territory on which the Latin colony of Luca arose.

[1] Serv. ad *Aen.* x, vs. 179.

[2] See Herodot. i. 165.

[3] Serv., *ibid.*, vs. 172; for Nicaea see Diod. v. 13. 4. In this passage, as is known, Diodorus also confuses Aleria with Calaris in Sardinia.

[4] Strab. v, p. 223 C.

were formerly flourishing and made use of their forests in constructing ships to guard against danger by sea, and then adds: "The Ligyens, more warlike than the Tyrrhenians, were for them bad neighbors, and even worse, enemies, attached to their flanks." This population, which was at the same time hostile to the Tyrrhenians and to the Ligurians, is evidently the Greek people which even Strabo mentions in connection with a tradition found in numerous other writers, including Vergil, to the effect that Pisa was a colony of the Pisaeans of Elis; a baseless tradition, which is due merely to the resemblance between the names of the two localities. There seems, however, no reason for doubting the existence at Pisa of a Greek factory, which naturally favored the growth of a tradition such as that mentioned above; and in this the direct source of Strabo, whether it was Artemidorus or Apollodorus, finds a confirmation and an illustration in the passage from Cato, and also in the statements of the commentary of Servius and in the verses of Lycophron as derived from Timaeus.

Strabo states explicitly that the Pisans contended against the Tyrrhenians, by which statement we are referred to the time of the maritime war between the Tyrrhenians and the Phocaeans of Marseilles and of Aleria in Corsica. It was the Tyrrhenians of Agylla who drove the Greeks from Aleria in Corsica, where nevertheless we find a Nicaea at a later period, and it was probably these who drove the Phocaeans from their station at Pisa, either alone, or else united with the inhabitants of Volaterrae, who, according to Servius, seized Populonia from the Corsicans.

In dealing with a series of facts to which we possess but scanty references—references which are either fragmentary, or often presented in a manner which obscures their real meaning—it is difficult to piece together our information and to convince students who approach the question from different standpoints, and who either follow their individual inspiration, or base their judgment upon the preconceived ideas of a critical school which, from a blind faith in the statements of ancient writers, has passed with excessive strictness to a skepticism that is often most unreasonable, especially when we have to deal with statements which do not rest

upon the direct authority of an ancient writer. These scholars to the contrary notwithstanding, however, it seems reasonable to suppose that the complex of references which we have just examined are derived from Timaeus, and that the tradition of the third century which, according to all probability, is based on earlier sources, especially Massilian (such as Euthymenes of Massilia, for example[1]), does not err in connecting the existence of Pisa in historical times with the colonial expansion of the Phocaeans. Even in the fourth and third centuries the Phocaeans continually visited the coast of Etruria, as is shown by the story of the Roman tripod which was sent to Delphi on a Massilian ship after the capture of Veii,[2] and by the fact that in the fourth century the Massilians sailed on commercial expeditions as far as Syracuse and Athens.[3] Another circumstance which tends to prove this is that Phocaean coins have been found along the coast between Populonia and Volaterrae, and that a portion of the Etruscan coinage is in imitation of that of Marseilles.[4] Moreover, a periplus of the fourth century[5] states that Pisa was connected with a Greek city on the Adriatic coast, probably Spina, by a road which it required three days to traverse. This bears witness to the importance of Pisa at that time, and increases the probability that although she became Etruscan, she still received in her port the ships of the Greeks, who, as we learn from the history of Syracuse, in the fifth and fourth centuries had possession for a certain length of time of the coast of Corsica and Elba, and were accustomed to lay waste the coast of Etruria.

To these historical considerations may be added others of a topographical character, since Strabo states that Populonia was the only Etruscan city situated on the sea.[6] This, however, applies also to Pisa, which in the earliest times was situated at the confluence of two rivers, and in a swampy region easily defended against the natives—a situation analogous to that of Venice.

[1] See Berger, *Geschichte d. wissensch. Erdkunde* (Leipzig, 1887), pp. 107 ff.

[2] Diod. xiv. 9. 3. [3] Demosth. *C. Zenoth.* 4, p. 883.

[4] Gamurrini in *Periodico di Numis.*, etc. (Florence, 1872), p. 208; Garrucci, *Le monete dell' Italia antica*, p. 47, Plate 71, Fig. 4.

[5] Pseud.-Scyl. 17; cf. *Studi storici*, II, pp. 67, 78. [6] Strab. v, p. 223 C.

We are not able to trace the history of Pisa in the third century, since the account of the wars of the Romans against the Etruscans after 298 B. C. unfortunately have been lost. We know that the Romans contended with the inhabitants of Volaterrae, whose territory was and still is next to that of Pisa, until 225, in which year the consul C. Atilius landed at Pisa on his return from Sardinia.[1] From this latter fact, together with the concession which in 180 the Pisans made of a portion of their territory to the Romans in order that the Latin colony of Luca might be founded,[2] it has been rightly concluded that Pisa was joined to Rome by a *foedus*, like Ravenna and possibly Genoa,[3] and also the Greek maritime cities of southern Italy.

It seems to me possible, however, that at that time Pisa had again passed into the hands of the Ligurians. It is true that the passages in Pseudo-Aristotle and Justinus stating that Pisa was in the territory of the Ligurians, may be explained by the circumstance that her territory adjoined that of this people, and still more easily by the fact that after the Second Punic War Pisa was for several decades the point where the Roman forces were concentrated against the Ligurians,[4] and that we find in Livy such expressions as "(provincia) Pisae cum Liguribus"[5] and "de provinciis deinde consultus senatus Pisas et Ligures provincias consulibus decrevit."[6] I prefer, nevertheless, to believe that Pisa was again conquered by the Ligurians, and am led to take this view both by the passages already quoted, of which one, that of Pseudo-Aristotle, is derived from a writer of the third century, of whom we shall speak later on, and also by the following considerations:

In the first place, Pisa is not recorded among the Etruscan peoples that in 205 aided P. Scipio Africanus, although in the list, in addition to the inhabitants of Perusia, Arretium, and Clusium, are mentioned those of Caere, Populonia, Tarquinii, Vola-

[1] Polyb. ii. 17. 1. [2] Liv. xl. 43.

[3] In spite of the opinion of Mommsen, I agree with E. Bormann (*loc. cit.*, p. 272) and Pedroli (*op. cit.*, pp. 7 ff.; p. 112) that this last passage refers to Luca and not to Luna.

[4] See the passages collected by Bormann, *loc. cit.*

[5] Liv. xxxviii. 35. 7. [6] Liv. xli. 14. 8.

terrae, and Rusellae, or all of the principal cities of the Tyrrhenian coast. Had Pisa been Etruscan at that time, she would surely have been included; for she was an ally of Rome, and, with her rich forests, which, as we have seen, had already been used for naval constructions, she was in a position to rival the generosity of the inhabitants of Perusia, Clusium, and Rusellae, who on that occasion furnished Scipio with "abietes in fabricandas naves."[1]

In the second place, it must not be thought that in the second century all of the Ligurians were barbarians like the inhabitants of the ridge of the Apennines. The proximity of the Etruscans and Massilians was not without results. During the third century the Ligurians formed a political confederation somewhat similar to that of the Lycians, who were likewise robbers both by land and by sea.[2] The Ligurians possessed a certain knowledge of military tactics, and in 177 succeeded in seizing the colony of Modena, which the Romans had founded six years before.[3] In 193 Pisa was besieged by 40,000 of them, and, when about to fall into their hands, was saved by the appearance of the consul A. Minucius.[4] Moreover, when the Romans founded Luna in 177, that city, as we have seen, was taken from the Ligurians, who, in turn, had taken it from the Etruscans.[5] It is especially important for our purpose to note that in the third century the Ligurians were greatly feared by sea. Plutarch[6] tells us that in 181 B. C. the Ligurian pirates had made themselves dreaded as far as the Strait of Gibraltar. Also Livy says that in that year the Massilians "de Ligurum navibus querebantur."[7] In another passage Livy states that one of the *duoviri navales* was intrusted with the surveillance of the coast from the "Promontorium Minervae" in Campania as far

[1] Liv. xxviii. 45.

[2] Liv. xxxiv. 56: "Ligurum viginti millia armatorum, coniuratione per omnia conciliabula universae gentis facta." Also the statement of Strabo (iv, p. 203 C.) concerning a road twelve stades wide granted by the Ligurians to the Romans, bears witness to a deliberation taken by all of the peoples living near the coast.

[3] Liv. xli. 17.

[4] Liv. xxxv. 2. The *scutum Ligustinum* adopted by the Roman army, and which was believed to be of Greek origin (see Liv. xliv. 35. 19; cf. Strab. iv, p 203 C.) also bears witness to the excellence of their military arrangements.

[5] Liv. xli. 13. [6] Plut. *Paul. Aem.* 6. [7] Liv. xl. 18. 5.

as Marseilles, and that five years later, in 176 B. C., the Senate ordered both *duoviri navales* "cum classe Pisas ire qui Ligurum oram maritimum quoque terrorem admoventes circumvectarentur."[1] Writers of a later period speak with admiration of the boldness of the Ligurians who on little barks braved the tempests, and for commercial reasons pushed as far as the Sardinian Sea and Africa.[2] And since the Ligurians were strong both by sea and by land, and were able to take the city of Luna from the Etruscans, it is at least possible that they could have taken Pisa. It is only by admitting this that we can explain why Pisa was placed among the Ligurian cities by Pseudo-Aristotle, who drew upon the third-century writer Timaeus, and upon the one who summarized the works of Trogus Pompeius, a writer who made use of good Greek historical works, and was especially well informed concerning the history of Marseilles and the Ligurians.[3]

In other words, it seems to me probable that the Ligurians were able to benefit by the decay of the maritime and land power of the Etruscans, which had received a crushing blow at the battle of Sentinum in 295 B. C.; and that, having attacked their nearest neighbors, they succeeded in capturing Luna and Pisa, and in driving the Etruscans from the upper Tyrrhenian coast. In the same manner, in the sixth and fifth centuries the Etruscans united with the Carthaginians against the Phocaeans, and forced them from Corsica and the Tyrrhenian shores, but were not able to drive them from Marseilles, which not only resisted the Etrusco-Carthaginian sea power, but also the Ligurians, who in the second century still gave them trouble.[4]

It is natural that in the second century Rome should have favored Marseilles at the expense of the Ligurians; but it is also

[1] Liv. xli. 17. 7. In 193 the prefect M. Cincius (prefect of the land garrison or *orae maritimae?*) informed the consuls that the Ligurians, after having devastated the territory of Luca and Pisa, "omnem oram maris peragrasse." Possibly this has reference to piracy along the coast as well as to an invasion by land.

[2] Diod. v. 39. 8 (=Poseidonius). Strab. iv, p. 203 C., on the authority of Polybius and his successor Poseidonius, also speaks of the maritime power of the Ligurians.

[3] Iust. xliii. 3. 4 ff.

[4] *Fast. triumph.* for 125 B. C; Liv. *Ep.* lx; Flor. i. 37, Halm.

natural that when, at the end of the fourth and during the third century, she was at war with the cities of northern Etruria, such as Aretium and Volaterrae, she should have encouraged the Ligurians in attacking these cities. This is no mere hypothesis. That the Romans were well disposed toward the Ligurians of Italy at this time is attested by the source of Plutarch (Polybius), who tells us[1] that in 181 Aemilius Paulus displayed much clemency in his victories over this people, because, instead of destroying the Ligurians, he wished to make use of them as a bulwark against the Gallic invasions with which Italy was continually threatened. Thus we see that this was a precept of the Roman policy, even though it was not generally practiced at that time. The fact is that the Ligurians and Gauls had many interests in common,[2] and about this time Rome had to proceed against the Ligurians with much energy. It is enough to recall that during the first decades of the second century Liguria was considered a consular province, and was intrusted to both consuls,[3] and that in 180 B. C. 47,000 Ligurian Apuani were transported, with their wives and children, into Samnium.[4] The fact that, the year before, Aemilius Paulus had shown himself so lenient is explained by his hope of deriving the political profit mentioned by Plutarch by the application of an old and tried principle of Roman policy in his dealings with the Ligurians, among whom the Romans had numerous allies, such as the Anamari near Piacenza, possibly Genoa, and certainly the Statielli, who had caused the consul M. Popilius so much trouble.[5] By admitting, finally, that at the end of the fourth or the beginning of the third century Pisa had again become Ligurian, we reach a full explanation of her alliance with Rome—an alliance which would be almost inexplicable should we hold

[1] Plut. *Paul. Aem.* 6.

[2] See, e. g., Liv. xxxiv. 48 (194 B. C.), 56; xxxv. 4. 6 (193 B. C.); xxxvi. 38 (191 B. C.); xxxvii. 2 (190 B. C.); cf. xxxvi. 39. 6: "bella Ligurum Gallicis semper iuncta fuisse."

[3] See, e. g., Liv. xxxviii. 42 (187 B. C.); xxxix. 1 (187 B. C.), 32 (185 B. C.), 45 (183 B. C.); xl. 1 (182 B. C.), 16 (182 B. C.), 36, 38, 41 (180 B. C.), 53 (179 B. C.); xli. 14 (176 B. C.); xlii. 1 (173 B. C.), 10 (172 B. C.).

[4] Liv. xl. 38. 40.

[5] Liv. xlii. 8 ff.

that she had remained in the power of the Etruscans, since in that case it would be necessary to concede that she had betrayed the national cause, which is most improbable considering the compactness of the league of Etruscan cities against Rome. Moreover, if Pisa had become Ligurian, we have an explanation of the fact that, together with Luna, Genoa, and Veleia, Pisa appears enrolled with the Ligurian cities in the Galerian tribe.

It now remains to explain the statement of Polybius to the effect that, of the Etruscan cities, Pisa was the nearest to the Ligurian border. Polybius says that the territory of the Ligurians extended as far as Pisa and Arezzo, the two cities which together with Luna were of importance in the military operations against the Ligurians;[1] and since in general this author gives data of a statistical nature, it is probable that by this he means to indicate the course of the Arno as marking the frontier of Italy and the confederate states on the side toward the Ligurian province, from the point where, according to Dante, this river *torce il muso* at the Arretines, to its mouth near Pisa. This is rendered even more likely by the fact that the valley of the Arno offered a natural highway for the Roman armies during the Ligurian wars.[2]

It is true that the best authorities on Roman history, including Mommsen and Nissen, maintain that before the time of Sulla, in addition to the Aesis, the borders of Italy were marked, on the one hand, by a locality near S. Giovanni, in the valley of the Arno between Florence and Arezzo, and, on the other, by the little river Fine to the north of Cecina, between Pisa and Volaterrae; and that in 81 B. C. Sulla extended them as far as the Rubicon and Pisa.[3] This theory, to which we gladly subscribe, does not oppose what we said above, since Pisa, as an allied city, must, it is true, have been situated outside of Italy proper, but, on the other hand, could not have been comprised within the *provincia Ligures* after the Ligurians had been entirely subjugated, although about

[1] In regard to Arezzo, see Liv. xxxi. 21; xxxiv. 56; xxxv. 3.

[2] Liv. xxxv. 3: "Minucius consul Arretium . . . . venit . . . . inde quadrato agmine ad Pisas duxit."

[3] Mommsen, *Röm. Gesch.*, I[6], p. 428; Nissen, *Ital. Landeskunde*, p. 71.

189 it had been considered a part of the Ligurian province.[1] This subjugation took place before the year 155, in which we find mention of a war against the Ligurian Eleati,[2] and some years before Polybius commenced to write his history.[3] It is evident that even if, as I believe, the Ligurians succeeded in conquering Pisa, between 300 and 225 B. C., they were not able to entirely obliterate its character as an Etruscan city, and much less to exercise such influence upon its vast territory, especially on the side toward Volaterrae. It is thus readily understood why the booty captured by the Ligurians on Pisan soil was termed Etruscan.[4] It was not even possible for the Ligurians to entirely remove the Etruscan imprint from the region between the Arno and the Magra, near which the Etruscans had once possessed Luna. It is therefore clear why many writers, as Strabo asserts,[5] gave the Magra as the dividing line between Liguria and Etruria. This is the border which is mentioned in the *descriptio Italiae* of Augustus,[6] was accepted by Dante,[7] and after nineteen centuries is still ethnographically correct.

[1] Liv. xxxviii. 35. 7: "consulibus, alteri Pisae cum Liguribus, alteri Gallia provincia decreta est."

[2] See *Fast. Triumph.*, ed. Schön., for this year. Since 176 B. C. Pisa had been separated to a certain extent from Liguria. Liv. xli. 14. 8: "senatus Pisas et Ligures provincias consulibus decrevit; cui Pisae provincia obvenisset," etc. Cf. Liv. xli. 15: "Pisae Cn. Cornelio. Ligures Petillio obvenerunt."

[3] See Susemihl, *Gesch. der griech. Litteratur in d. Alexandrinerzeit*, II, pp. 107 ff.

[4] Liv. xxxv. 21 (192 B. C.).

[5] Strab. v, p. 222 C.

[6] Plin. *N. H.* iii. 48 ff.

[7] Dante, *Paradiso*, ix, 89 ff.

XXIV

AN ERROR IN APPIAN CONCERNING THE *BELLUM PERUSINUM*

In his account of the *bellum Perusinum* Appian states that the commencement of the burning of the famous and wealthy city which gave its name to this war was the work of a certain Cestius Macedonicus, and affirms that the entire city was destroyed with the exception of the temple of Hephaestus, or Vulcan (*χωρὶς τοῦ Ἡφαιστείου*). This, he says, was the end of one of the most important cities of the Etruscans, a people who *Ἥραν ἔσεβον*, and adds that after the fire those who *τὰ λείψανα τῆς πόλεως διέλαχον, τὸν Ἥφαιστον σφίσιν ἔθεντο θεὸν εἶναι πάτριον ἀντὶ τῆς Ἥρας.*[1]

In these words we have a striking proof of the haste with which Appian, even though he was accustomed to draw from trustworthy sources, reproduced and summarized the works which he read. Dio Cassius is certainly much more accurate when, in narrating briefly the burning of Perugia, he expresses himself as follows: *καὶ ἡ πόλις αὐτή, πλὴν τοῦ Ἡφαιστείου τοῦ τε τῆς Ἥρας ἕδους πᾶσα κατεκαύθη· τοῦτο δὲ (ἐσώθη γάρ πως κατὰ τύχην) ἀνήχθη τε ἐσ τὴν Ῥώμην ἐξ ὄψεως ὀνείρου ἣν ὁ Καῖσαρ εἶδε.*[2] Following this, Dio Cassius alludes to the colonies sent by Augustus to Perugia, to whom also the above-quoted words of Appian refer: *ὅσοι τὰ λείψανα τῆς πόλεως διέλαχον.* The cults of Vulcan and of Hera were contemporary at Perugia, according to Dio, and the statement of Appian to the effect that those who inhabited Perugia after its burning substituted Vulcan for Hera as guardian of the city is evidently due to a misunderstanding of the reference to the carrying to Rome of the statue of Hera. This image suffered the same fate as, according to tradition, did that of Juno Regina after the taking of Veii.

[1] App. *B. C.* v. 49.

[2] Dio Cass. xlviii. 14. 5.

In what manner, however, was the cult of Hephaestus, or rather of Vulcan, associated with that of Hera or Juno? In a well-known passage of the interpolator of Servius[1] we read: "prudentes Etruscae disciplinae aiunt apud conditores Etruscarum urbium non putatas iustas urbes, in quibus non tres portae essent dedicatae et tot viae et tot templa Iovis, Iunonis, Minervae." I do not intend to undertake here the by no means easy investigation of the value of this statement, and much less do I intend to determine how and when it came about that this triad of divinities which are associated together, penetrated to certain cities of central Italy, such as Rome and Falerii. I limit myself merely to recording that there are said to have existed traces of the cult of Minerva at Perugia also in pre-Roman times.[2]

The chief object of this discussion, however, is to call attention to the fact that, in place of the cult of Hephaestus or Vulcan as divinity *paredros* of Juno, we should expect to find that of Jupiter at Perugia just as we do at Rome and Falerii. This difficulty is not so great as it seems at first glance. I have elsewhere treated of a group of facts and arguments[3] which seem to me to prove that up to the age of Pyrrhus the most ancient Jupiter of Rome was honored under the name of Vulcanus-Summanus, and that for this reason the region at the foot of the Capitoline Hill and adjoining the Comitium continued till a late period to be called the *area Volcani*. The name of Hephaestus, as preserved by Appian and Dio Cassius, would seem to confirm this statement, and is of assistance, as it seems (differently from that which occurred in the case of the Umbrian Iguvium, for example), in proving that the primordial divinity of the state retained the ancient name of Vulcan.

[1] Serv. ad *Aen.* i. 422.

[2] I do not hesitate to attribute to Peiresa or Perugia the coins edited by Garrucci (*Le monete dell' Italia antica*, Plate LXXVI, Fig. 15, p. 59), on which one sees the head of Athena. Garrucci, with other numismatists, attributes them to an unknown city called Peithesa on account of a letter which he writes as an O and interprets as a Θ. If I am not mistaken, it is really a P; cf. the coins of Tuder, *op. cit.*, Plate LXXV, Figs. 16 ff. The existence of a form *Peiresa* beside the more common *Perusia* may also be derived from Steph. Byz., s. v. Περραίσιον . . . . τὸ ἐθνικὸν Περραισηνές.

[3] See my *Storia di Roma*, I, 2, pp. 175 ff. and *passim*.

GATE OF THE CITADEL, PERUGIA

The correspondence between the earlier Vulcan and the more recent Jupiter naturally reminds us of the gloss on Hesychius where we read Γελχάνος ὁ Ζεὺς παρά Κρησίν, and of the coins of Cretan Phaestus which allude to this god.[1] Instead of venturing on uncertain ground, however, I prefer to remain in the field of local history, and discover, if possible, in what part of Perugia the temple of Hephaestus and Hera was located. According to the passages from Appian and Dio Cassius, the temple of these divinities was the only one which was saved from the flames. According to the statement of Dio Cassius, it was saved merely by chance (ἐσώθη γάρ πως κατὰ τύχην); but, with due respect for his authority, it seems to me that the non-destruction of the temple was not so much accidental as because of the nature of its situation. Even those who have paid but a single visit to Perugia have no difficulty in recognizing that the temple of Vulcan and Juno must have been located in the highest portion of the city, or on the top of the hill which constituted the *arx*, and which was separated from the rest of the city by an inclosing wall. It is a noteworthy fact that at this point is situated the *porta Sole* which has been recorded by Dante,[2] and that in the immediate neighborhood of this region rises today the church of S. Lorenzo, the largest Christian temple of Perugia. To judge from what has been the case in many other Etruscan cities, as for example Grosseto, which succeeded Rusellae, and at Orvieto or Urbs vetus, both in mythology and in Christian worship S. Lorenzo seems to have been substituted for the ancient Vulcan. The same phenomenon seems to have occurred at Spoleto, where, according to the observations of local investigators, S. Elia appears to have been substituted for the ancient cult of the Sun. If this were definitely established, it would be less difficult to understand why the tenth of August, the day consecrated to S. Lorenzo, should be held in southern Tuscany to be the hottest of the year, and why the twenty-third of the same month was sacred to Vulcan.

[1] Head, *Hist. num.*, p. 401.

[2] Dante, *Paradiso*, xi, 47.

XXV

TWO GREEK INSCRIPTIONS FOUND IN SARDINIA

I

Kaibel,[1] publishes an inscription found at Cagliari, as follows:

HPAIEΣ · ΔIONYΣO · ANEΘHK ||

and, after stating that it was preserved by Augustine, cod. Matrit. Q. 87. f. 60′, and that he had learned of it through Mommsen, he adds: "Videtur legendum K]*ρά*[*τη*]ς Δ*ιονύσ*[*ῳ*] *ἀνέθηκ*[*εν*. Hermam Libero dono datam Caralibus inventam habes *CIL*, X, 7556."

From the *Bullettino archeologico Sardo* of Spano, Kaibel might have seen that the inscription is still preserved in the National Museum of Cagliari. From a squeeze of my own taking I read:

HPAEEIΣ ΔIONYΣΩI ANE | ΘHK //

Ἡ*ραεεῖς* Δ*ιονύσῳ* *ἀνέθηκ*[*αν*

It is hardly necessary to note that Augustine saw the inscription when it was less mutilated. The letters ΘHK are not visible today.

It is important to determine whether this inscription is of Sardinian origin. Monsignor Cavedoni thought that the Heraeans mentioned were those of Arcadia.[2] He was opposed by P. Martini, of Cagliari, who, on account of the reference of Ptolemy[3] to a place called Ἥ*ραιον* in the northern part of the island, attributed the monument to the inhabitants of that obscure village.

This last opinion was unfortunately accepted by me in my article on the traces of Greek inhabitants in Sardinia.[4] I am now convinced that the inscription is not Sardinian, but belongs to

[1] Kaibel, *Inscr. Gr., Sic. et It.*, no. 605.

[2] Cavedoni, *Bull. Arch. Sard.*, VI (1860), p. 77; VII (1861), pp. 163 ff.; Martini, *ibid.*, pp. 171 ff.

[3] Ptol. iii. 3. 7.

[4] "La Sardegna prima del dom. rom." *Atti dei Lincei* (Rome), p. 57, n. 2. This has recently been sustained by Wilamowitz-Möllendorff (*Hermes, Lesefrüchte*, XXXIII, p. 524), who did not have at hand the present article.

Greece proper. In the first place, the marble on which it is cut is certainly not of Sardinian origin, and I am assured that it is Greek, and probably Parian. Moreover, the character of the cutting, and the relief which is sculptured below it, lead to the same results. In the center of a well-executed bas-relief is seen an actor in female attire, and holding a mask in his hand. Before him, to the right of the beholder, where the inscription becomes mutilated, there are traces of another figure. To the left there is a nude male figure, holding in his hands two objects which the condition of the monument makes it impossible to recognize.[1] Above his head are three theatrical masks for male rôles. In front, to the left, a large two-handled amphora stands on the ground.

Other objects of this nature are known. Thus the bas-relief of Philiscus[2] offers a close analogy to the one under discussion. That our relief, however, is earlier and belongs to a good Greek period is shown by the cutting of the letters and the style of the carving. The letters are well formed and elegant, worthy of the period following the archonship of Euclides (403 B. C.). The style of the sculpture is Attic and easily of the fourth century B. C., as I am assured by the authoritative judgment of my colleague, Gh. Ghirardini.

Leaving aside the question of the age of the monument, we may be certain that it did not originally belong to Sardinia. It is true that Ptolemy speaks of a Ἥραιον on the island, and this town was probably of Greek origin and situated near Olbia,[3] which too, according to all probability, was a Greek city.[4] But even if we admit that at certain points on the shores of Sardinia, such as Olbia and Neapolis, there were established sporadic Greek colonies,

[1] In the right-hand corner there was probably an oenochoe, and in the left a patara, with a possible allusion to a sacred libation. From the absence of Silenic characteristics in the masks we may suppose the monument to represent a tragic rather than a comic subject. Its poor state of preservation, however, prevents further considerations of this nature.

[2] Schreiber, *Kulturhist. Atl.*, I, Plate 5, Fig. 4.

[3] See La Marmora, *Voyage*, II, p. 403; C. Müller ad Ptol., *loc. cit.*, p. 384. A small island near Sardinia had the name of *Heras lutra;* cf. Plin. *N. H.* iii. 85.

[4] Cf. my pamphlet entitled *Storia di Olbia* (Sassari, 1895).

PLATE XI

Relief and Inscription from Sardinia

it would be strange to think that there was a Greek theater at Cagliari, and that the inhabitants of distant Heraeum should have honored with gifts the Dionysus there worshiped. Such a supposition could only appear probable in case Sardinia had been conquered by Greek rather than by Punic civilization. Even if we should hold that the monument dates from Roman times (which I believe impossible), no one could believe that a small village lost among the mountains would have preserved such important traces of Greek life, when Olbia itself so soon became thoroughly Roman.

It is useless, however, to dwell longer upon such hypotheses. The contents and form of the inscripiton, the sculptured relief, and the nature of the stone show the monument to be from Greece, and possibly from Athens itself, where the cult of Dionysus was of such great importance.

Having excluded the Heraeans of Sardinia, it remains to discover who were the Ἡραέες or Ἡραεῖς who dedicated the monument. Cavedoni thought they were the Heraeans of Arcadia, where there existed a temple of Dionysus the Citizen and Dionysus the Increaser.[1] Others have connected them with the Ἡραεῖς who formed one of the five κῶμαι and μέρη of the territory of Megara,[2] and where also the cult of Dionysus was popular.[3] It is more probable, however, that, as Maass recognized, instead of giving the name of a city, the monument refers to an association of dramatic actors who took the name of their founder Heraeus.[4] As was the case with many other objects, it was transported to the shores of Sardinia from some maritime city of Greece, probably at a late period, although earlier than the beginning of the seventeenth century.[5]

[1] Paus. viii. 26. 1. [2] Plut. *Quaest. Gr.* 17. [3] Paus. i. 40. 6.

[4] Cf. Poland, *De collegiis artific. ap. Gr.* (Dresden, 1895; dissertation of Wettinger Gymnasium); Maass, *Jahrb. d. K. deutsch. arch. Inst.*, XI (1896), p. 102 ff.

[5] On the back of the monument is the sepulchral inscription of the Sardinian Francesco Arca Dessì, who died in 1603. It was found in 1849 in the church of the cemetery of Bonaria near the shore; see Spano, *loc. cit.*, p. 129. Another case of an inscription transported to Cagliari is offered, I believe, by no. 140 of the *Corpus Inscr. Semiticarum*, in which is mentioned Venus Erycina. I have found

II

Of Sardinian origin, on the other hand, is probably a noteworthy fragment of a Greek inscription found at Oristano and described by Tamponi,[1] as follows: "square tile of tufo on which are deeply incised the rough letters ZAMA." This pretended tile is in reality a bit of sandstone (*banchina*), similar to that on which are cut the Greek inscriptions of Sicily, and also the Phoenician remains of the Punic city of Tharros, near the finding-place of the present example.

The few letters of the inscription have not attracted the attention even of those who have published it, but are of great importance for the study of the inscriptions of Sardinia. The fragment is now in the possession of Sig. P. Tamponi, of Terranova. My reading of it is as follows:

ϝάνασ . .

The letters are archaic character and deeply cut. They read from right to left. At the beginning there are clear traces of the digamma, which show also on a cast of the inscription. Between the second Λ and the ≷ the space is greater than between the other letters. Considering the irregular character of many of these archaic inscriptions, it does not follow that the ≷ formed part of another word, especially as the initial ϝ seems to oppose such an opinion. There is not sufficient space between the ≷ and the fracture to enable us to determine whether it was followed by another letter on the same line, or whether the next letters came below.

The inscription is clearly from the sixth, or at the latest from the

material similar to that on which this is cut at Eryx itself, and the monument probably comes from there or from the neighboring Trapani. On the other hand, the Greek inscription found at Cagliari and published by Kaibel (no. 606; Ἵππαρχος [Ἡ]γησιστράτου) is, from the nature of the marble, really Sardinian. It, and no. 609 as well, are in the museum of Cagliari. In the latter Kaibel fails to note that the *a* is always cut thus: Ⱥ.

[1] *N. S.*, 1891, p. 363.

very beginning of the fifth, century B. C. Were it from a Greek city, it would evoke some discussion as to the the presence of the san and digamma, but would attract no great attention.[1] Coming as it does from Sardinia, on account of the lack of other documents from the same period, it offers no occasion for similar discussion, but furnishes material of another nature for possibly even more important consideration.

It might be thought that the fragment was brought to Sardinia from some other country, such as Sicily. Sailors often take as ballast the stones which they find on the shore, and for this reason the same inscription is often reported from several and widely separated lands.[2] Moreover, the fragment was found at Oristano (Othoca), which is not far from the sea, and in antiquity was even nearer to the gulf of the same name. It should be noted, however, that the material of the fragment is the same as that of the inscriptions from the neighboring Tharros, which makes its Sardinian origin at least very probable.

The difficulty lies in explaining the presence of an inscription of the sixth century, or possibly even of earlier date, on an island and in a region which at that period commenced to recognize the Punic hegemony. It is true that in the Punic necropolis of Tharros there were found two Greek sepulchral inscriptions of two Massilians,[3] one of which, incised on a stele of the same sandstone, is preserved in the museum of Cagliari, and seems fairly ancient. It is, however, written from left to right, and belongs to a much later period than our fragment. It may be noted here that opposite Tharros, about seventeen miles from Oristano, the city of Neapolis was located, the name of which probably alludes to the presence of a Greek emporium. The Massilians, although enemies of the Carthaginians, like all commercial peoples, must have had relations with them, and on their way to Carthage could not have helped

[1] In regard to the characters it may merely be noted that the ϟ is the same as that on a bronze cymbal from Misitha near Messene; see Röhl, *I. G. A.*, no. 50.

[2] Cf., for example, *CIL*, X. no. 3702, seen by Beloch at Cumae, by Acton and Agosta in Sicily, and by me at Venice. The inscription really seems to be Dalmatian.

[3] Kaibel (*I. G. S. I.*), nos. 609, 610.

visiting the eastern coast of the island. If we find them at Tharros, we expect all the more to find them at Neapolis, which was probably a Greek emporium under Punic supervision, as was Naucratis in Egypt, or, to take an even more striking example, as was Neapolis in the Zeugitana, at the very gates of Carthage, and where, as it seems, the Siceliots had the right to disembark.[1]

The probability of this theory is shown by the fact that the inhabitants of Sardinia sent to Delphi a bronze statue of their eponymous hero Sardus.[2] The temple of Sardus Pater stood on a promontory near Neapolis,[3] and it seems probable that the sending of a similar gift to a Greek temple must have some connection with the presence of this city with a Greek name, even though Pausanias (probably on the authority of Polemon) says that it was a gift *βαρβάρων δὲ τῶν πρὸς τῇ ἑσπέρᾳ οἱ ἔχοντες Σαρδώ.*

Even the above does not explain the presence at Oristano of our fragment, which dates back to an earlier period. At the most, it may be noted that in the necropolis of Tharros, where Greek vases of the fifth century and later have come to light, some were discovered which are attributed to the sixth century.[4] If the inscription is not earlier, it may at least be from the period when the Punic domination in Sardinia began (about the middle of the sixth century), and was, at any rate, incised when the Carthaginians made their pertinacious and successful struggle against Greek expansion in the west. In this connection it is hardly necessary to recall that the Carthaginians always showed themselves jealous of the possession of Sardinia.[5]

[1] This may be derived from the statement of Thuc. vii. 50. The presence of a Neapolis near a city termed Othoca (*It. ant.*), or *Uttea* (*Tab. Peut.*) or *Ὀθαία* (Ptol.) causes one to suspect that Neapolis is the Greek version of the Punic name of Carthage, opposed in Sardinia as in the Zeugitana to the *ancient city* or Utica. Cf. the Latin inscription from Uselis, which is very near Othoca (*CIL*, X, no. 7846: *ī]ulius lu . . . . nus utice[nsī]s*). In regard to the Zeugitana, see Meltzer, *Gesch. der Karthager*, I, pp. 91 ff. Even admitting this, however, the Greek name still shows Greek influence.

[2] Paus. x. 17. 1.

[3] Ptol. iii. 3. 2.

[4] Now in the museums of Sassari and Cagliari.

[5] Cf., for example, the well-known treaties between Rome and Carthage of various periods.

The various legends regarding the arrival of Iolaus, the Thespians, and Aristaeus[1] would seem to presuppose the arrival of Greek ships and colonists in Sardinia at an early period. These legends, however, instead of mirroring authentic research in matters pertaining to such early immigration, were brought into being by the maritime hegemony of Syracuse, which at the time of Dionysius I exercised much influence over the coasts of Corsica and Sardinia. Nevertheless, we cannot be positive that at the end of the seventh century, or during the sixth and the beginning of the fifth, some attempts were not made by the Greeks to establish themselves in Sardinia. The Samians and Phocaeans who at the end of the seventh century (630) pressed as far as Tartessus, and in the following century founded Massilia, and who about 562 B. C. established themselves, if only for a short period, in Corsica, must also have come in contact with the coast of Sardinia. A knowledge of this island on the part of the Greeks is also presupposed by the advice which about 546 B. C. Bias gave to the Ionians to found there a pan-Ionic colony—advice which in 499 B. C. was repeated by Aristagoras of Miletus,[2] likewise to the Ionians. But if Bias thought that the Ionians who were to establish themselves there would become prosperous and powerful, and if Istieus, the cousin of Aristagoras, believed that it was possible to conquer this island and render it subject to Persia,[3] it is evident that during the sixth century the Carthaginian domination in Sardinia (this is also confirmed by the story[4] of the defeat of Malcus or Mazeus) was by no means firmly established, and that it was thought possible to gain even that island for Greek colonization.[5]

If, however, as everything leads us to believe, our epigraphic fragment belongs to Sardinia, it is not to be considered as an

[1] [Arist.] *De mir. ausc.* 100; Diod. iv. 29; v. 15; Strab. iii, p. 225 C.; Paus. vii. 2. 2; ix. 23. 1; x. 17; [Apollod.] ii. 7. 6. 2.

[2] Herodot. i. 170; v. 124. [3] *Ibid.* v. 106; cf. vi. 2. [4] Iust. xvii. 7. 2 ff.

[5] I attach no importance to the statement that Manticlus, after the taking of Ira, proposed that the Messenians go to Sardinia (Paus. iv. 23. 5), since, granting the worthlessness of the tradition regarding the details of the wars of Messene (see Niese, *Hermes*, XXVI [1891], pp. 1 ff.), it may also be that this advice of Manticlus is merely a proleptic duplication of that of Bias.

isolated example of the presence of Greeks on the island, but is connected with other literary data, which unfortunately are also fragmentary.

We know very little of the history of Greek colonization in the West, and very little also of the deeds of the Phocaeans of Massilia in their wars against Carthage. It is only by chance, and as a mere episode, that Herodotus informs us of the war of the Phocaeans of Aleria and the Carthaginians with their Etruscan allies. Such is the dearth of literary tradition that further information of this nature is wanting.

In regard to the monuments the case is different. Although Sardinia possesses very little authentic history, she has as recompense archaeological material which is both abundant and homogeneous. This serves to control and to complete the data of the ancient authors, and, much more than do similar monuments for other regions of more mixed population, serves to give a clear idea of the degree of culture attained by the inhabitants. To cite a single example, Sardinia was one of the regions from which the Phoenicians and later, the Carthaginians, derived their supply of tin. This fact was demonstrated by archaeological finds some years ago,[1] but, strangely enough, has as yet attracted very little attention among students. It is not improbable that at some future day, at some place on the coast of this practically deserted island, will be found other archaic Greek inscriptions in addition to the four letters from Oristano which have seemed worthy of this brief comment.

[1] See the observations of F. Nissardi in the *Bull. Arch. Sardo.* (Cagliari, 1884), Appendix, pp. 20 ff.

XXVI

THE TIME AND PLACE IN WHICH STRABO COMPOSED HIS HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY

The problem as to when and where Strabo composed his Historical Geography seems at first sight important merely from a philological point of view, but it is in reality as much, or even more, deserving of solution from a historical standpoint. Strabo is an important source for the political and administrative history of his time.

To know *where* he wrote is equivalent to establishing the number and character of his sources of information. To know *when* he wrote is especially valuable for determining the date of many events for which he is often the only source, and of which he did not fix the chronology for the evident reason that he was not writing a history, but a work which was a commentary on, and an appendix to, his history, which has not come down to us.[1] This investigation is all the more important because not only the few references in ancient writers to the time in which he lived, but also the opinions of modern students concerning the time and place in which he composed his works, are, in my judgment, generally erroneous. Hesychius of Miletus says that Strabo lived at the time of Emperor Tiberius,[2] and even the best modern writers, such as Mommsen and Nissen, thinks that his Geography was written at that period.[3]

[1] That the work of Strabo, rather than being a geography in the proper sense of the word, is a historical geography, and a commentary and appendix to the historical works which he had previously written, was first recognized by Niese (*Hermes*, XIII, p. 45). Cf. Miller, *Die Alexandergeschichte nach Strabo* (Würzburg, 1882); Luedke, *Leipziger Studien*, XI, pp. 14 ff.; cf. also Otto (*ibid*, supplementary vol), who especially from the geography has diligently collected the fragments, or better the passages, which refer back to the *ἱστορικὰ ὑπομνήματα*. See my observations in the *Riv. di filol. class.* (Turin), XV, pp. 145, 212.

[2] Cf. Suid. and Eudocia, s. v. *Στράβων*.

[3] See Mommsen, *Res gestae divi Augusti*, 2d ed., p. 119; Nissen, *Ital. Landeskunde*, I, p. 15; Schaefer, *Abriss. d. griech. u. röm. Quellenkunde*, 2. Abth., 2.

This opinion has been even better formulated and worked out, certainly with much cleverness and learning, by Professor Niese, whose statements have been very favorably received by scholars generally.[1] According to Niese, Strabo wrote his Geography at Rome at the instigation of Roman friends who were conspicuous in political affairs. With one of these, Aelius Gallus, he went from Rome to Egypt, and with him returned to Rome, where between 18 and 19 A. D. his Geography was written.

In an earlier article, in which especial attention was paid to the value of the numerous passages in Strabo referring to administrative affairs, I also have treated these questions, and have sought to show the error in some of Niese's conclusions.[2] According to my results, Strabo composed his works, not at the instigation of politicians at Rome, but from the point of view of a Greek from Asia Minor, and in the interest of the Greeks of that region. His Geography, written much earlier than the time of Tiberius, was merely retouched at a later period. A re-examination of the writings of Strabo confirms me in most of these conclusions, and offers a series of fresh arguments, thanks to which I hope to determine with greater precision the above-mentioned problems.

I. THE TIME WHEN STRABO WROTE HIS HISTORICAL GEOGRAPHY

The question as to whether the Geography of Strabo is a product of the age of Tiberius and written between 18 and 19 A. D. should

Aufl., p. 96. As differing more or less from the common opinion may be mentioned Forbiger (*Handbuch d. alt. Geographie*, I, pp. 306 ff.), who does not see the work of an old man in the fresh and vivid style of Strabo; Meineke (*Vindiciae Strabonianae*, p. vi), who believes that his works were written at different periods and never completed; P. Meyer (*Quaestiones Strabonianae* [Leipzig, 1879], pp. 58 ff.), who thinks the first seven books were written between 6 and 5 B. C. and 2 A. D., and books viii–xvii between 2 and 18 A. D.; Bunbury (*Hist. of Anc. Geogr.*, II, p. 213), who holds that the geography in its present form dates from 18–19 A. D., but that we do not know when it was commenced nor finished. These scholars, however, merely state opinions without proofs. Even Meyer failed to arrive at the correct conclusion from the two or three good observations which we shall examine in their proper place.

[1] Niese, *Hermes*, XIII, pp. 33 ff.; cf. Christ, *Gesch. d. griech. Litteratur*, par. 420; Butzer, *Ueber Strabos Geographica* (Frankfurt a. M. 1887), p. 30; P. Otto, in his article on the ὑπομνήματα of Strabo in *Leipziger Studien*, XI, p. 11.

[2] See *Riv. di filol. class.* (Turin), XV, pp. 97 ff.

be answered with a decided "No." In something over twenty places Strabo names the emperor Tiberius and records events which took place during his reign, but the greater portion of the other events which he describes, and of which he was the contemporary, are connected with the civil wars occurring after the death of Caesar, and with the period of the life of Augustus embraced between the years 31 (battle of Actium) and 7 B. C. Of the events which took place in the final years of the reign of Augustus, between 6 B. C. and 14 A. D., but few are mentioned, possibly four. Moreover, although there is mention of events of the years 17–18 A. D., there is no allusion to the Gallic wars of 6 A. D., and, above all, none to the Germanic and Pannonic wars of 4–11 A. D., in which Tiberius played such an important and noteworthy part.[1] This silence is all the more inexplicable if we admit that the Geography was written about 18 A. D., inasmuch as Strabo takes every occasion to praise Augustus and even Tiberius. He often mentions the deeds of Augustus, and records the expeditions of Tiberius in the year 9 B. C., against the Vindelici and Rhaeti.[2] Indeed, Strabo pushes his respect for, or his fear of, Tiberius to such a point that, although he mentions Octavia, the sister of Augustus, Marcellus, his son, and Agrippa, he is purposely silent in regard to the name and deeds of C. Caesar, the son of Agrippa, who was adopted by Augustus, and the known enemy of Tiberius, even where he records the siege of Artagira in which Gaius received the wound that was the principal cause of his death, and although he recalls the name of Adon, who was, as we know from other sources, the one who inflicted the wound.[3] It is, therefore much more reasonable to suppose that the Geography was composed before 5 B. C., or even shortly after 9 B. C.

This hypothesis is confirmed by a brief analysis of book vii, which is given up to a description of Germany, Illyricum, Thrace, etc. There it is said that, in deference to desires of Augustus, the

[1] See below, pp. 390 f.

[2] Strab. iv, p. 206 C., vii, p. 292 C.

[3] Strab. xi, p. 529 C.: *Ἀρτάγειρα δὲ ἀπέστησε μὲν Ἄδων ὁ φρούραρχος, ἐξεῖλον δ' οἱ Καίσαρος στρατηγοὶ πολιορκήσαντες πολὺν χρόνον;* cf. Dio Cass. lv. 10[a], *a, b;* Vell. ii. 102. 2.

Roman armies never crossed the Elbe.[1] This was true up to 7 B. C., but not later, for between that period and 1 A. D. the Elbe was crossed by Domitius Aënobarbus, who obtained a triumph on account of his Germanic victories.[2] Strabo states that Baton was leader of the Breuci and Daesitiatae, two tribes of the Pannonians.[3] But Baton the Breucian died in 8 A. D., killed by his namesake, Baton the Daesitiatan, who in 9 A. D. had to give himself up.[4] Of this war on the part of Baton, which was considered as most terrible by contemporaries, there is no trace in Strabo, but there are numerous mentions of the Illyric wars of Augustus and of the undertakings of the elder Drusus, whose death is also recorded.[5] Since, however, in this book there is an isolated mention of the defeat of Quintilius Varus and of the triumph of Germanicus, it is but natural to suppose that the text was retouched in 18 A. D., although it had already been composed not later than 1 A. D., later than which the expedition of Aënobarbus could not have taken place. If this is admitted, it is also explained why Strabo says nothing of the romanizing of Pannonia and Moesia, which were already Roman provinces, the former since 10, the latter since 6 A. D.;[6] and why in his description of Italy, in speaking of Ravenna, he mentions the gladiators placed there by the government,[7] but does not state that Baton was exiled to that point.

A confirmation of this, with even greater precision in point of time, is offered by the final page of the Geography, in which, among the provinces governed by the Roman Senate, are mentioned those of Achaia, Macedonia, Sardinia, Illyricum, and Gallia Narbonensis.[8] Achaia and Macedonia became imperial provinces in 15 A. D., and Sardinia in 6 A. D. Illyricum was recaptured by Augustus in 11 B. C., and Gallia Narbonensis had been restored to

[1] Strab. vii. 291 C.; cf. p. 294 C.: τὰ δὲ πέραν τοῦ Ἄλβιος τὰ πρὸς τῷ ὠκεανῷ παντάπασιν ἄγνωστα ἡμῖν ἐστι.

[2] Dio Cass. lv. 10a. 2; Tac. *Ann.* iv. 44; Suet. *Nero* 4. I owe this observation to Meyer, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

[3] Strab. vii, p. 314.

[4] Dio Cass. lv. 29 ff.

[5] In 9 B. C.; Strab. vii, p. 291 C.

[6] See Marquardt, I², pp. 292, 302.

[7] Strab. iv, p. 213 C.

[8] Strab. xvii, p. 840 C.

the Senate in 22 B. C.[1] We may therefore justly hold that this list was written between 22 and 11 B. C. It is true that Strabo says that this enumeration was antiquated, and that it corresponded to the original partition of the provinces between Caesar and the Senate (*ἐν ἀρχαῖς* 27 B. C. which was not exact, since Gallia Narbonensis did not become senatorial till 22 B. C.); but from this very assertion we conclude that the work was composed for the first time not long after 11 B. C., and that it was retouched at a later period, and probably, as we shall see, not at Rome, but far from that city.

That the writing may have extended some years after 11 B. C. is shown, not only by the full knowledge of the Alpine wars of Tiberius and Drusus (9 B. C.), and the recognition of the complete subjugation of the Alpine peoples and the Ligurian Montani (25–8 B. C.)[2] but by the mention of certain historical events as having occurred *recently*. The present state of the inhabited world was indicated by Strabo with the expressions *καθ' ἡμᾶς*, *ἐφ' ἡμῶν*, *νῦν*, and *νυνί*; the events which had recently occurred at the time when he wrote were indicated with the adverb *νεωστί*. With a *νεωστί* he records the death of Juba, king of Mauretania who died after 19, but not later than 23 A. D.;[3] the liberality of Tiberius toward the cities of Asia Minor which had been afflicted by earthquakes;[4] and, finally, the coronation of Zenon as king of Greater Armenia,[5] which occurred in 18 A. D. In these passages *νεωστί* is used in its proper significance; but how shall we explain certain other passages where the word indicates events which occurred long before 18 A. D.?

The planting of a colony by Caesar at Corinth,[6] an event concerning Regium at the time of the Sicilian war of Sextus Pom-

[1] Marquardt, *Röm. Staatsverw.*, I², pp. 248, 265, 299, 319, 331.

[2] Strabo (iv, p. 203 C.) recalls the organization of the provinces of the Maritime Alps which occurred in 14 B. C. (see Marquardt, I², p. 279). The date of the complete subjugation of the Alpine peoples is shown by an inscription from La Turbie (*CIL*, V, 7817) of 8 B. C., the year following that of the death of Drusus, which is, as it happens, recorded by Strabo.

[3] xvii, pp. 828 C., 829 C.

[4] xiii, pp. 621, 627 C.; xii, p. 579 C.

[5] xii, p. 556 C.

[6] vii, p. 379 C.; 44 B. C.

peius against Octavianus,[1] and the death of the Sicilian robber Selurus, which occurred shortly after 25 B. C.,[2] are recorded with the word *νεωστί*; and so are also the expeditions of Varro against the Salassi,[3] that of Aelius Gallus against Arabia,[4] and the return of Augustus, from the wars against the Cantabri.[5] It seems natural to conclude that these various *νεωστί*'s indicate the different periods when Strabo was at work upon the composition of his Geography. No importance attaches to the objection that this *νεωστί* should be taken in the sense of an event *last in regard to the time* when Strabo wrote, and not in the sense of "recently," since he indicates with a *νεωστί* the burning of the temple of Ceres near the Circus at Rome[6]—an event which occurred in 31 B. C.[7] If Strabo were really at Rome in the year 17 A. D., when the triumph of Germanicus which he describes took place, and if he wrote the first seven books of his Geography either in that or in the following year (as is sometimes concluded from iv, p. 206 C.), it is difficult to understand how he could have indicated with a *νεωστί* an event which had occurred forty-eight years before, especially since it was precisely in the year 17 A. D. that the temple of Ceres near the Circus Maximus, after having been rebuilt was dedicated anew by Tiberius.[8] It is therefore probable that he wrote of the burning many years before 17 A. D., and that we should assign its natural signification to the adverb *νεωστί*.[9] Moreover, if we consider that, aside from the *νεωστί*'s which indicate events occurring after 17 A. D. and those referring to events before 24 B. C., there are but two relating to occurrences falling between these two dates, and that one of

[1] vi, p. 258 C.; 38–36 B. C.

[2] vi, p. 273 C.; see p. 227 of my article in *Riv. di filol. class.* (Turin), XV, pp. 97, ff.

[3] iv, p. 205 C.; 25 B. C.

[4] iv, p. 218 C.; xvi, p. 780 C.; 24 B. C.

[5] xvii, p. 821 C.; 24 B. C.

[6] viii, p. 381 C.

[7] Dio Cass. l. 10. 3.

[8] Tac. *Ann.* ii. 49.

[9] The fact that Strabo often joins the adverb *νεωστί* with a *καθ' ἡμᾶς* or an *ἐφ' ἡμῶν* does not detract from its meaning, since he also uses these expressions to indicate recent events, and those near the time when he wrote, as, e. g. (xiii, p. 627 C.): *τοῦ Τιβερίου πρόνοια τοῦ καθ' ἡμᾶς ἡγεμόνος*; cf. my *op. cit.*, p. 219, n. 1.

these refers to the founding of the military colony of Patrae,[1] and the other to the revolt of the city of Tanais, which was repressed by Ptolemy (an event which could have happened only between the years 14 and 8 B. C., when Ptolemy was king of the Cimmerian Bosphorus), we are again led to the same result as before—that there is in the writings of Strabo a great gap between the events referring to 7 B. C. and those coming after 17 A. D., and that the first writing of the text took place about the year 7 B. C.[2]

If these conclusions are admitted to be correct, we have an explanation of the otherwise strange fact that in the works of Strabo there is neither use nor mention made of the great geographical undertaking of Agrippa, who caused to be made the huge map of the empire which Augustus and Polla, the sister of Agrippa, displayed to the public in the portico of Vipsanius. It is evident that if Strabo had been at Rome when this map was completed and displayed, he would have made use of it, if only for the description of Italy and of the West.[3] And, even if he had been at Rome, he could not have made use of this map before

[1] In 14 B. C.; Strab. viii, p. 387 C.

[2] Other events, the chronology of which is less certain, are indicated with a νεωστί. In books iii, p. 141 C., in a corrupt passage Strabo speaks, as it seems, of the transportation of soldiers to the colony of Hispalis, which was possibly planted by Caesar, or perhaps later by Augustus in 25 or 15 B. C. (see my *op. cit.*, p. 189, n. 3; p. 192, n. 3). In book iii, p. 169 C., the word is used in connection with a Roman census, which is elsewhere (v, p. 213 C.) recorded with a simple καθ' ἡμᾶς This might refer either to the census of 29–28 B. C. or to those of 8 B. C. and 14 A. D. (see Mommsen, *Res gestae, etc.*, p. 36). I prefer to attribute the reference to one of the first two mentioned. Strabo also records with a νεωστί the disturbances brought about in Sparta by Eurycles (viii, p. 366 C.; cf. Flav. Ios. *Ant. Iud.* xvi. 10. 1; *Bell. Iud.* i. 26. 1). Although chronologically it is difficult, or even impossible, to determine the year of the banishment of Eurycles, it is nevertheless certain that this took place several years after 8 B. C., the year when through him Alexander and Aristobulus, the sons of Herod, perished. Indeed, two successive accusations were needed to induce Augustus to punish him. That this entire passage is a later addition is shown by the coins (see below, p. 396). In like manner, we cannot tell when Strabo speaks of the mines of Taegetus (viii, p. 367 C.), nor when the ascension of Aetna occurred which several writers think was accomplished by Strabo himself (p. 274 C.). In both of these cases a νεωστί is used.

[3] For the fact that Strabo did not make use of the map of Agrippa, see my article in *Riv di filol class.* (Turin), XV, pp. 158 ff. In this I agree with Nissen (*Ital. Landeskunde*, I, p. 17).

7 B. C., because in that year it was not yet completed.[1] Finally, if we admit that Strabo completed his Geography about 7 B. C., when he was about fifty-eight years of age, after having, as he himself says,[2] finished his history, it follows that he wrote and completed this work while still in possession of all his physical and mental powers. If we accept the opinion of Niese that it was written between 18 and 19 A. D., we come to the, if not impossible, at least very improbable, conclusion that he undertook the writing of the Geography after having passed his eightieth year.

It is of no avail to object that Strabo had already made the ample collection of historical material which appears in his Geography in previous years, while composing his purely historical work on Alexander the Great, and the *ὑπομνήματα ἱστορικά* (which were a continuation of the work of the great Polybius, and which included even contemporaneous times. No matter how little value one may attach to prolegomena in which questions of mathematical and astronomical geography, and in a certain sense of historical geography as well, are treated, and even though Strabo is not a geographer in the true sense of the word, nevertheless this work was of necessity the result of many years of labor, and was, as Strabo himself says, a *κολοσσουργία*.[3] He would not have called it thus if he had, as it were, scribbled it off in a couple of years between 18 and 19 A. D. This consideration alone should have prevented scholars from asserting so positively that the Geography was written at the time of the emperor Tiberius.

We have said that in the Geography of Strabo there is abundant mention of historical facts which took place between 31 and 7 B. C.; that there are but three or four places which record events falling between the years 6 B. C. and 14 A. D.; and that in about twenty places there is mention of Tiberius, or of events which refer to the years 17–18 A. D. Let us now examine briefly each of the seventeen books, and endeavor to discover what passages have been either retouched or added to the original text after the year

[1] See Dio Cass. lv. 8. 4 (7 B. C.): *ἡ δὲ ἐν τῷ πεδίῳ στοά, ἣν ἡ Πόλλα ἡ ἀδελφὴ αὐτοῦ ἡ καὶ τοὺς δρόμους διακοσμήσασα ἐποίει, οὐδέπω ἐξειργάσατο.*

[2] i, p. 13 C.

[3] i, p. 14 C.

17 A. D. In this way we shall find other arguments to corroborate our thesis.

Books i, ii.—In the first two books, which serve as preface, there is no special historical allusion later than that to the Arabian expedition of Aelius Gallus, which is spoken of as having "recently" (*νεωστί*) occurred in 24 B. C.[1] The other references to the wars against the Celts, Germans, etc., are vague and indefinite.[2] It may be noted, however, that Strabo alludes to the expedition of M. Antonius against the Parthians as to an event which had occurred not long before,[3] and that he asserts that the Romans had become acquainted with Germany only as far as the Elbe[4]—words which, as we have shown, could have been written only before the expedition of Aënobarbus.[5] In book ii, however, Strabo cites Cn. Piso as witness for the form of the oases of Libya: *ἡγεμὼν γενόμενος τῆς χώρας*.[6] Who was this Piso? Niese[7] asserts that he was the known enemy of Germanicus, who is said to have been proconsul of Africa,[8] and who, according to Tissot,[9] governed that province between 1 B. C. and 11 A. D. It is true that the expression *ἡγεμών γενόμενος τῆς χώρας* would seem to indicate the governor of a province, and yet it seems to me that we should guard against asserting with such positiveness that this Piso was the enemy of Germanicus. I have shown[10] that Strabo's description of Libya was written with the aid of early geographers, especially Artemidorus, and with material drawn from the historians who narrated the wars of Jugurtha and Caesar. Except for the statement

[1] Strab. ii, p. 118 C.

[2] i, p. 10 C., ii, pp. 93, 117 C.

[3] i, p. 10 C.; 36 B. C. Strabo here mentions the expedition against the Parthians together with the ambushes of the Germans and Celts, who fought *ἐν ἕλεσι καὶ δρυμοῖς ἀβάτοις*. This is the same expedition of Antonius which is mentioned elsewhere (e. g., xi, p. 524 C.; xvi, p. 748 C.). It may also be supposed that Strabo alludes to the ambushes to which Quintilius Varus fell victim (9 B. C.), of whose defeat he speaks in the passage (vii, p. 291 C., according to my theory added in 18 A. D.) in which he alludes to the triumph of Germanicus. These words, however, may also refer to the defeat of Lollius (16 B. C.).

[4] i, p. 14 C.

[5] Between 7 B. C. and 1 A. D.

[6] Strab. ii, p. 130 C.

[7] Niese, *loc. cit.*, p. 44.

[8] L. Sen. *De ira* i. 18, 19.

[9] Tissot, *Fastes d'Afrique*, p. 44.

[10] See my *op. cit.*, pp. 205 ff.

referring to Juba's ascension of the throne of Mauretania, and to the death of this king, it would be useless to search for any reference to the arrangements made by Augustus in regard to the provinces of Cyrenaica, Proconsular Africa with Numidia, and the kingdom of Mauretania itself, where various Augustan colonies were also located. Thus, for example, Strabo knew of the planting of a colony by Caesar at Carthage, but does not mention the fact that Augustus also placed one there (29 B. C.). It seems strange that he did not wish to know more about the ἡγεμών of Africa than that which was recognized by everyone, and which Strabo himself says was asserted by many other writers (ὥσπερ οἵ τε ἄλλοι δηλοῦσι καὶ δὴ καὶ Γναῖος Πείσων . . . . διηγεῖτο ἡμῖν). Why did he refrain from giving the same information that he gives in his description of Egypt and Spain? It seems possible, therefore, that this Piso may have been the father of the enemy of Germanicus, or else the Cn. Piso who fought so fiercely against Caesar in Africa in 47 B. C.[1] It is true that the expression ἡγεμὼν τῆς χώρας means, strictly speaking, "governor of the province," and that the one in charge of Africa was not Piso, but Considius.[2] It should be noted, however, that the term ἡγεμών is used by Strabo in various senses, and to indicate Augustus, Tiberius,[3] and the Roman provincial governors, without defining whether their grade was consular, praetorian, etc.;[4] and, finally, to denote generals and commanders of the Roman armies.[5] The expression is really vague and indefinite both elsewhere and here since the passage in question does not state that Piso was governor of Procunsular Africa, but τῆς χώρας—that is to say (as is clearly seen from the preceding description of Libya), of the region which extended from Alexandria in Egypt to the Pillars of Hercules. Had Strabo wished to convey the idea that Cn. Piso was a governor of a province, he would have stated of what province, since in his time

[1] Tac. *Ann.* ii. 43: "Cn. Pisonem . . . . insita ferocia a patre Pisone, qui civili bello resurgentes in Africa partes acerrimo ministerio adversus Caesarem iuvit." Cf. Asin. *Bell. Afr.* 3, 18.

[2] Cic. *Pro Ligar.* 1; Asin. *Bell. Afr.* 3.

[3] Strab. vi, p. 288 C.; xiii, p. 627 C.; xiv, p. 675 C.

[4] xii, p. 569 C.; xiv, p. 659 C. [5] xii, p. 560 C.; xiv, p. 654 C.

Libya embraced the two provinces of Cyrene and Proconsular Africa joined to Numidia. Since it is evident that in his description of Libya Strabo is especially disposed to record events of the war of Caesar, and since the word ἡγεμών is by him used to express various degrees of command, at times referring to Roman *imperatores*, and at other times to governors in general, I see no reason why it might not refer either to the Cn. Piso who as *legatus* commanded the Numidian and Mauretanian cavalry in Africa,[1] or to the consul of 23 B. C.—the Piso to whom, according to Michaelis, Horace is said to have dedicated his famous epistle which we are accustomed to call the *Ars poetica*.[2]

Book iii.—In the description of the Iberian peninsula there are no references to the period before 15 B. C., at which time the last military colonies are said to have been founded.[3] Nevertheless, in one passage,[4] after recording the military arrangements made by Augustus in the western and nothern regions of the peninsula, Strabo goes on to say: "Moreover, Tiberius, following the example of Augustus, his predecessor, sent to these regions three legions (i. e., the fourth Macedonian, the sixth Victrix, and the tenth Gemina), the very presence of which did much, not only toward pacifying, but also toward civilizing a portion of these peoples." It seems to me that this passage was later retouched, and that this statement was added merely as a sign of homage to the new emperor, Tiberus.[5]

Book iv.—In the description of the Gauls there is no reference to the period before 12 B. C., in which year Drusus dedicated the

[1] Asin. *B. Afr.* 3, 18.

[2] A. Michaelis in the *Comment. Mommsen*, p. 420.

[3] Dio Cass. liv. 23.

[4] Strab. iii, p. 156 C.

[5] The reader who desires further details in this connection I refer to my article in *Riv. di filol. class.* (Turin), XV, in which I have enumerated and discussed the various references in Strabo of a historical and administrative character. There, however (pp. 200 ff.), I wrongly stated that the mention made by Strabo to the administrative arrangement of the three Spanish provinces (III, p. 166 C) should be referred to the age of Tiberius. Strabo himself says that they refer to 27 B. C.: νυνὶ δὲ τῶν ἐπαρχιῶν τῶν μὲν ἀποδειχθεισῶν τῷ δήμῳ τε καὶ τῇ συγκλήτῳ; cf. Marquardt, *op. cit.*, I², p. 253; Mommsen, *Res gestae divi Aug.*, p. 222; *Röm. Gesch.*, V, p. 58, n. 1.

altar of Augustus at Lyons.[1] By admitting that the work was written shortly after that year, we may explain why Strabo does not mention either the altar of Narbona of 11 A. D., or that of the Ubii, which was already in existence in 9 A. D.; and it also becomes clear why he does not speak of the institution of the military provinces of the two Germanies. I have already said that in the portion of this book given up to the description of the Alps there is no allusion to events occurring after the wars of Drusus, who died in 9 B. C.; and for my own part I do not hesitate to assert that the following words were added in 18 A. D.—words which, as it happens, follow immediately after the mention of the wars of Drusus against the Rhaetians: "So that they have now lived for thirty-three years in profound peace, always promptly paying their tribute."[2]

Books v, vi.—I have already shown[3] that the two books which Strabo dedicated to Italy were compiled from old material. They contain no references to a period earlier than 8 B. C., with the apparent exception of a few passages connected with the description of Rome, and certain others on the final page of book vi (p. 288 C.), where the peoples who were subject to Rome were enumerated. I hope to show that these two were retouched at a later period.

In speaking of the Parthians on the final page of book vi, after mentioning the fact that their king, Phraates, sent his sons to Augustus (8 B. C.), Strabo adds: "And more than once in our days the Parthians have caused to come from Rome the prince whom they wished at their head. It even seems that they are on the point of placing themselves and their property in the hands of the Romans."[4] That these words contradicted what Strabo himself elsewhere says of the Parthians,[5] and that they do not apply to this people, who not many times, but once only, during the life of Strabo accepted a king from the Romans (i.e., Vonones; about 8 A. D.), has been noted by Meyer,[6] who, rightly I think, believes

[1] Strab. iv, p. 192 C.

[2] iv, p. 206 C.

[3] *Op. cit.*, pp. 147 ff.

[4] Strab. vi, p. 288 C.

[5] xi, p. 515 C.

[6] *Op. cit.*, p. 61. Meyer, however, neither here nor elsewhere makes good

that they have been displaced, and that they refer to the Armenians, whom Strabo mentioned shortly before, and who at the time of Augustus four times accepted from him a king whom he favored and protected.[1]

We must now try to decide to what year the words of Strabo refer. It seems to me that they can apply only to the condition of the Armenians in 18 A. D., when Zenon, son of Pythodoris and of Polemon, king of Pontus, was crowned by Germanicus as king of Greater Armenia (a fact which is elsewhere recorded by Strabo himself).[2] These words, however, do not harmonize with what Strabo shortly before said of the Armenians: "As to the Armenians, and those peoples known by the name of Albanians and Iberians who dwell above Colchis, they merely need the presence of a Roman legate. That suffices to restrain them, and if they are active today, it is because they know the Romans are elsewhere occupied."[3] This condition of affairs evidently does not fit the year 18 A. D., but rather seems to have reference to the frequent turmoils of the previous years which succeeded the coronation of Tigranes II (placed on the Armenian throne by Tiberius in the name of Augustus, 20 B. C.), and which lasted throughout the reign of his successor, Artavasdes. Indeed, these turmoils were protracted till the reign of Vonones (about 8 A. D.), and even till after his expulsion (about 12 A. D.).[4] In spite of these troubles, Strabo says that the Armenians were easily restrained. This statement enables us more easily to determine the time when these words were written, since they are adapted only to the time when the Parthians seized Armenia, after Tigranes II and Artavasdes had been driven from the throne. To restore order, Tiberius was sent by Augustus in 6 B. C. He refused the task, however, and preferred voluntary exile on Rhodes,[5] thus making it possible for the Parthians to remain in control of Armenia till 1 B. C., when C. Caesar placed the

use of the two or three of his observations which are worthy of note, in establishing the date of the composition of the Geography.

[1] See *Res. gest. divi Aug.* v. 24 ff.

[2] Strab. xii, p. 556 C.

[3] vi, p. 288 C.

[4] Mommsen, *Res gestae divi Aug.*, pp. 112 ff., 143 ff.

[5] Vell. ii. 110.

Mede Ariobarzanes on the throne. From this we are led to the conclusion that the original text of Strabo must have been written before 6 B. C.

This being granted, it is but natural that in 18 A. D., there should have been added to this page the statement that the Cappadocians were no longer governed by their kings (Archelaus, the last king of Cappadocia, died in 17 A. D.), and that, after the passage recalling the merits of Augustus, the following words should have been inserted: "Tiberius, his son and successor, takes him as example in his policy and administration, just as his own children, Tiberius and Drusus, follow their father."[1] We have seen that the final page of book xvii must have been written about 11 B. C., or shortly after. From this examination of the last page of book vi, which is in many respects similar to that of book xvii, we must conclude that it was written shortly after 8 B. C., the time when Phraates sent his sons as hostages to Rome, since this is the most recent fact which Strabo mentions in its first redaction.

Let us now examine the description of Rome. Strabo speaks, it is true, of the mausoleum of Augustus, and adds: "it contains his remains, and those of his relatives."[2] It should be noticed that the mausoleum was already under construction in 23 B. C., the year when Augustus deposited the ashes of Marcellus there,[3] and that in 12 B. C., he caused to be brought thither those of Agrippa,[4] and in 9 B. C. those of Drusus.[5] In preparing his own mausoleum while still alive, Augustus followed a practice which was very common in antiquity, so that it does not seem strange that the words *θῆκαί εἰσιν αὐτοῦ* may have been written some years before 14 A. D., when Augustus died.[6] This hypothesis seems all the more probable when we bear in mind that of the various public edifices recorded in the description of Rome, not one was built after the

[1] Strab. vi, p. 288 C.

[2] vi, p. 236 C.

[3] Dio Cass. liii. 30. 5.

[4] Dio Cass. liv. 28. 5.

[5] Dio Cass. lv. 2. 3.

[6] Much less do the preceding words, *ἐπ' ἄκρῳ μὲν οὖν εἰκών ἐστι χαλχῇ τοῦ Σεβαστοῦ Καίσαρος*, lead us to believe that the words in question were written after 14 A. D. It will suffice to recall that on the Pantheon which Agrippa built: *ἐν δὲ τῷ προνάῳ τοῦ τε Αὐγούστου καὶ ἑαυτοῦ ἀνδριάντας ἔστησε* (Dio Cass. liii. 27. 3).

portico of Livia which is there mentioned, and which was dedicated in 7 B. C.[1] If the description of Rome had been written after 14 A. D., we should have expected to find in it mention of the various edifices dedicated in the final years of the reign of Augustus, such as the temple of Concord, which was dedicated by Tiberius in 11 A. D.;[2] the portico of Julius, dedicated in the following year;[3] and the temple of Ceres, which was restored and dedicated by Tiberius himself in 17 A. D., but which, as we have seen, is mentioned by Strabo as if it had been recently destroyed (*νεωστί*, although this really occurred in 31 B. C.). And, above all, we should have expected some reference to the portico of Vipsanius, which, among the various monuments of Rome, was the one most likely to awaken interest in the author of a geographical work. It was because Strabo wrote about 7 B. C. that he could not speak of the portico of Agrippa, which, as we have seen was not yet completed in that year.[4] For the same reason, although Strabo speaks of the triumph of Germanicus, and records the names of Thusnelda and Thumelicus, in describing Ravenna, aside from the statement that gladiators were placed there by the government,[5] he gives us no more important information than that one of the great imperial fleets was stationed there, and that to that city were exiled both Baton the Desitiatan and Thumelicus.[6] Does not this also seem to show a later working-over of book v?

In the description of Campania, there are likewise frequent allu-

[1] Becker, *Röm. Alterth.*, I, pp. 542 ff.

[2] Dio Cass. lvi. 25. 1.

[3] Dio Cass. lvi. 25 extr.

[4] It may be objected that Strabo speaks of the *στρατιωτικὸν ἐκ τῶν ἀπελευθεριωτῶν* instituted by Augustus (v, p. 235 C.), which, according to Dio Cassius, was organized by that emperor in 6 A. D. (lv. 26. 4). It seems to me, however, that Dio Cassius here alludes to the rearrangement of this body into seven cohorts; and that it existed as early as 36 B. C. we learn from Appian: *καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνου φασὶ παραμεῖναι, τὸ τῆς στρατιᾶς τῶν νυκτοφυλάκων ἔθος τε καὶ εἶδος* (*B. C.* v. 132). As we shall see, Strabo was in Rome in that year. Without good reason, Mommsen (*Röm. Straatsr.*, II², p. 1009) doubts the accuracy of this passage from Appian. It is but natural to suppose that Rome was not second to a small town such as Nemausus, where from 30 B. C. on there existed the *praefectus vigilum* similar to that of Alexandria. See Hirschfeld, *Wiener Studien*, V, pp. 319 ff.

[5] *τοὺς μονομάχους*: Strab., p. 213 C.

[6] Tac. *Ann.* i. 58.

sions to the defensive works of Agrippa, and to the undertakings at Lakes Avernus and Lucrinus, but no reference to the stationing of a fleet at Cape Misenum. Nevertheless, in speaking of Naples, Strabo says: "and the quinquennial games which are there celebrated, and which consist of gymnastic contests and musical competitions (these competitions often last for several days in succession), rival the best that Greece can offer in this respect."[1] It would seem that Strabo here alludes to the celebrated games instituted in honor of Augustus, and termed Italic and Isolympic, which are frequently mentioned by the authors, and are often recorded in the inscriptions.[2] When were these instituted? From a passage in Dio Cassius,[3] Mommsen wishes to derive that they were dedicated to Augustus for the first time in 2 B. C. An inscription, on the other hand, assigns their founding to 2 A. D.[4] Thus Dio is held to allude to them four years before the date established by a practically official monument. The fact is that Dio does not state that they were founded in that year, but merely that they were decreed in honor of Augustus. His words are as follows: *αὐτῷ δὲ δὴ τῷ Αὐγούστῳ ἀγών τε ἱερὸς ἐν Νεαπόλει τῇ Καμπανίδι, λόγῳ μὲν ὅτι κακωθεῖσαν αὐτὴν καὶ ὑπὸ σεισμοῦ καὶ ὑπὸ πυρὸς ἀνέλαβε, τὸ δ' ἀληθὲς ἐπειδὴ τὰ τῶν Ἑλλήνων μόνοι τῶν προσχώρων τρόπον τινὰ ἐξήλουν, ἐψηφίσθη.*[3] On the other hand, it is noteworthy that Strabo, who often and willingly takes occasion to recall the deeds of Augustus and to speak of events which redound to his honor, although he mentions these games, does not say that they were dedicated by that emperor. It may be supposed, therefore, that the games had been in existence for some time; that a municipal decree of the Neapolitans (Dio speaks of a municipal decree in 2 B. C.) consecrated them to Augustus, who a short time before had benefited the city when it was afflicted by earthquakes; and, finally, that not till the ensuing Olympiad (the word is not inappropriate, since we are speaking of Isolympic games), or in 2 A. D.,

[1] Strab. v, p. 246 C.

[2] See Mommsen, *CIL*, X, p. 171; Beloch, *Campanien*, pp. 58 ff.

[3] Dio Cass. lv. 10. 9.

[4] See *CIG*, no. 5805.

were they recognized as Augustan games, or as Ἰταλικὰ Ῥωμαῖα Σεβαστὰ Ἰσολύμπια, as the inscription officially calls them.[1]

Even if we grant that in this reference Strabo really alludes to the institution of the Augustan games in 2 A. D., we should merely have before us one of four passages in the Geography referring to events which took place between 7 B. C. and 7 A. D., and the only one connected with the West. And even in this case it is not difficult to see how Strabo could have become cognizant of games which rivaled the best that Greece could offer, and which took place at Puteoli, the most important commercial port of the world at that time.

Book vii.—We have already discussed this book. There only remains to be examined a passage where, in speaking of the Cimbri, Strabo says that they "sent to the emperor their most precious possession, a sacred caldron, asking for friendship, and pardon for their faults."[2] Mommsen[3] thinks that this passage refers to the Germanic expedition of Tiberius of 5 A. D. But we have seen that there is no mention in Strabo of the Germanic and Pannonic wars of Tiberius of the years 4–11 A. D. It seems to me more natural to believe that Strabo alludes to an event which occurred during the Germanic expeditions of 11–9 B. C., at which time

[1] It should be noted here that in the description of Campania, in connection with contemporary events, there is exclusive mention of the war of Sextus Pompeius and of the works of defense of Agrippa (38–35 B. C.; see Strab. v, p. 243 C.). Moreover, there is reference in general to the settling of colonists at Capua, but no specific mention of the Augustan colony which could not have been later than 31 B. C. (see *CIL*, X, 3826). There is also a record of the exchange effected between Augustus and the Neapolitans, at the time when the emperor gave up Ischia to Naples and received Capri in return (29 B. C.; see Dio Cass. lii. 43). With these facts in mind, and also remembering that the games occurred quinquennially, we may fix their first establishment either in 34 B. C., after the fall of Sextus Pompeius, or in 30 B. C., one year after the victory at Actium, and the year of the conquest of Alexandria. In the latter case the Neapolitan games would be but little anterior to the famous musical or gymnastic games (also quinquennial) which Augustus instituted at Nicopolis in memory of the victory at Actium (29 B. C.; Dio Cass. li. 2). In speaking of these, Strabo says: ἤγετο δὲ καὶ πρότερον τὰ Ἄκτια τῷ θεῷ, στεφανίτης ἀγών, ὑπὸ τῶν περιοίκων νυνὶ δὲ ἐντιμότερον ἐποίησεν ὁ Καῖσαρ (vii, p. 325 C.). Here, too, Augustus is said to have reorganized formerly existing games—a fact which Dio neglects to mention.

[2] Strab. vii, p. 293 C.

[3] Mommsen, *Res gest. div. Aug.*[2], p. 105.

Drusus incorporated the Batavi and Frisones into the Roman Empire; proceeded with his fleet along the shores of the North Sea; seized several islands, among others that of Burcanis;[1] and pushed by land as far as the Elbe. According to Strabo, the Cimbrians asked pardon for the trouble they had made the Romans. This trouble could not have been caused by sea, and the fleet of Drusus must even have inspired respect among them. The fact that Strabo erroneously places the Cimbrians between the mouth of the Rhine and that of the Elbe,[2] which, he asserts, had never been crossed by a Roman army, in connection with the other fact, already alluded to, that Strabo makes no mention of the expeditions of Tiberius of the years 4–11 A. D., makes it all the more probable that the Cimbrians came in contact with the elder Drusus. As is known, Drusus never crossed the Elbe.

Books viii–x.—These books, which are given up to the description of Greece and of the islands of the Aegean, have been shown by Niese[3] to be made up of ancient literary material, and are among the least rich in contemporary historical allusions. The most recent event[4] of the old redaction, it seems to me, is the reference to the founding of the military colony of Patrae (14 B. C.). The only passage added about 18 A. D. is that recording the death of the Spartan Eurycles, and the loss of ἐπιστασία by his son also.[5] Coins show that Eurycles was supreme magistrate at Sparta at the time of Augustus, and also that his son regained the lost power under Claudius, but contain no record of this family at the time of Tiberius.[6] If these conclusions are valid, we must also admit that the passage which states that Eurycles (ὁ καθ' ἡμᾶς τῶν Λακεδαιμονίων ἡγεμών) possessed Cythera, has been retouched.[7]

Book xi.—In this book, devoted to the description of the countries lying north and south of the Caucasus, and of the

[1] Cf. Strabo vii, p. 291 C.

[2] Strab. vii, pp. 249, 291 C.

[3] *Rhein. Mus.*, XXXII, pp. 267 ff.

[4] Indicated with a νεωστί; Strab. viii, p. 387 C.

[5] Strab. viii, p. 366 C.

[6] For the family of Eurycles in general, and for their coins, see Weil, *Ath. Mitth.*, VI (1881), pp. 10 ff.

[7] Strab. viii, p. 363 C.

northern regions of Asia, the most recent events of those which, it seems to me, belong to the first redaction of the text, are the subjugation of Tanais, which rebelled against King Ptolemy between 14 and 8 B. C.,[1] and the death of this king in 8 B. C.[2] The reference to the siege of Artagira[3] I hold to have been inserted later, at the time of Tiberius, about 18 A. D. At this period also, or shortly afterward, there was added a portion of the passage in which, after narrating at length the deeds of Tigranes I, king of Armenia, and later those of Artavasdes, who died after the battle of Actium in 30 B. C., Strabo expresses himself as follows about subsequent affairs: "After him [Artavasdes] Armenia had still several sovereigns who reigned under the protectorate of Caesar and the Romans, and this protectorate endures to the present day."[4] The brevity of this statement, which contrasts with the elaboration of what goes before, is not surprising, since here as elsewhere Strabo neglects the events previous to the battle of Actium, for the reason that he had already narrated them in the History, to which his Geography formed an appendix and a commentary.[5] The words "had still several sovereigns" may refer to the various Armenian kings who recognized the Roman hegemony (i. e., Artavasdes, Tigranes III, Ariobarzanes, Artavasdes II) from after the time of Tigranes II, who came to the throne in 20 B. C., until that of Tigranes IV, who died in 36 A. D. The words, "and this protectorate endures to the present day," better suit the state of Armenia in 18 A. D., and agree with those of book vi, p. 288 C., which have certainly been displaced, and which I regard as referring, not to the Parthians, but to the Armenians.[6] Another possibility however, is that the last-quoted phrase was inserted in 18 A. D., and that the preceding words, which had been written earlier (about 7 B. C.), were merely retouched in 18 A. D.

[1] xi, p. 493 C.

[2] xi, p. 495 C.

[3] xi, p. 529 C.; 2 A. D.; see below, p. 426.

[4] xi, p. 532 C.

[5] In like manner, the references of Strabo to the Parthians (xi, p. 515 C.) and to the Medes (p. 523 C.) are vague and few, and difficult to place chronologically.

[6] See above pp. 390 f.

Books xii–xiv.—We have seen that in the books dedicated to Greece, a country little known to Strabo and little visited by him, the references to recent historical events are few and far between. In books xii–xiv, on the other hand, in which he describes the regions and provinces of Asia Minor between the Euxine and Aegean Seas and the Taurus, such references are fairly numerous. In these regions Strabo spent most of his life, and he was writing of familiar ground.

The description of Cappadocia would seem at first glance to have been written shortly after Tiberius and the Senate had voted for its admission as a Roman province in 18 A. D. The words of Strabo are as follows: "What will henceforth be the administrative division of Great Cappadocia we cannot yet say, a recent decree of Caesar and the Senate, intervening after the death of King Archelaus, having placed this kingdom among the number of Roman provinces."[1] If it were true that Strabo composed all of his Geography after the beginning of 18 A. D., and that in that year he composed at least the first four books, it would be difficult to explain how in such a short space of time (in a year or a little more), and at the age of eighty, he could have composed eight books (the fifth to the twelfth), which would seem to require the labor of many years. In that case, too, it is hard to see why, if he waited so long before commencing to write, no matter whether he lived at Rome or elsewhere, he should not have been better informed of the measures which the Romans had taken for the administration of the various provinces. If, however, we admit that the work was retouched here and there in its various portions, in 18 A. D., we find most natural the phrase just quoted, and also may explain why the accurate and minute description of Cappadocia corresponds to the region as it existed at the time of Archelaus. Of the original redaction we find a trace, for example, in the passage where, in speaking of Cataonia, Strabo says: "Its inhabitants, although Cataonians by origin, and nominally subject to the king of Cappadocia, are more correctly subject to the high-priest

[1] Strab. xii, p. 534 C. Cf. the beginning of the same page, and also Tac. *Ann.* ii. 56.

[of Ma]."[1] As a later addition may be recognized the rather lengthy passage in which, in describing Lesser Armenia, Strabo speaks of Queen Pythodoris, widow of Polemon (died 8 B. C.), and of Archelaus (died 17 A. D.), and of their children. Among these he mentions Zenon, *νεωστί* made king of Armenia (18 A. D), and the daughter who married the Thracian leader Cotys, whose death is mentioned.[2] The passages referring to this princess[3] have evidently been added to this book, and in part worked over, with the exception of xiv, p. 649 C., which may have been written earlier, and with the exception of the enumeration of the benefits conferred by Tiberius on Sardis and the other cities injured by earthquakes.[4]

The most recent events which may be referred to the first writing of the text are, first, the death of Polemon,[5] and, secondly, the bringing of Amasia under Roman control.[6] As additions to the text of book xiii may be mentioned the passage where, having spoken of M. Pompeius Theophanes, son of the historian and procurator of Augustus, Strabo says: *καὶ νῦν ἐν τοῖς πρώτοις ἐξετάζεται τῶν Τιβερίου φίλων*;[7] the mention of the earthquakes which had recently (*νεωστί*) devastated Magnesia near the Sipylus;[8] and the place where are again recounted the benefits conferred by Tiberius on the cities of Asia which these earthquakes had damaged.[9] As additions to book xiv may be cited the passage which mentions the island of Eleusa, the royal seat of Archelaus, who is spoken of as already dead, and that in which, after a long discourse on his friend Athenodorus, teacher and intimate friend of Augustus, and his administration at Tarsus, mention is made of the Nestor who taught Marcellus (died 22 B. C.), and who succeeded Athenodorus as governor of that city. Since we know that Athenodorus was alive in 8 A. D.,[10] and since Nestor is spoken of as one no longer alive, it seems at least probable that this passage was inserted in the Geography shortly before 18 A. D.

[1] xii, p. 535 C.
[2] 18 A. D.; xii, pp. 555 ff.
[3] xi, p. 499 C.; xii, pp. 557–59 C.
[4] xii, p. 579 C.; 17 A. D.
[5] xii, pp. 556 C., 558 C.; 8 B. C.
[6] 7 B. C.; Strab. xii, p. 561 C.
[7] xiii, p. 618 C.
[8] xiii, p. 621 C.
[9] xiv, p. 627 C.; 17 A. D.
[10] See Eusebius, ed. Schöne, II, p. 146.

On the other hand, the passage in which, concerning the Cilician Tarcondimotus who died in 31 B. C., it is said, *τὴν διαδοχὴν τοῖς μετ' αὐτὸν παρέδωκε*,[1] seems to have been written long before 18 A. D., since it contains allusions to the two Philopaters, of whom the first came to the throne in 20 B. C., and the second died in 17 A. D.[2] If, as is not improbable, their principality was added to Syria in 18 A. D.,[3] as was Commagene (the transformation of which to a province is known to Strabo, xvi, p. 749 C.), we must admit either that Strabo forgot to work over this passage, or else that in 18 A. D., when he revised his work, no action had as yet been taken in regard to this small Cilician state. These two hypotheses may easily be made to agree. If we remember that in the above-quoted passage Strabo declares that he does not know what measures the Romans had taken in regard to Cappadocia, and that he shows himself ignorant of the fact that a small state in Cilicia had been given to the successors of Archelaus,[4] we may conclude that he retouched his text before Germanicus had succeeded in putting in order the affairs of all the oriental provinces (i. e., in 19 A. D., when he went to Egypt).[5] To the second redaction of the text, finally, would belong the passage referring to the deeds of P. Sulpicius Quirinius against the fierce Homonades,[6] since, as Mommsen has made practically certain,[7] these pirates were destroyed by Quirinius about 3–2 B. C.[8]

Book xv: India, Persia.—Like book xi, this contains very few allusions to contemporary events. The most recent is certainly

[1] Strab. xiv, p. 676 C.

[2] See Marquardt, I², p. 386. [3] See Nipperdey ad Tac. *Ann.* ii. 56.

[4] Which, if not certain, is at least very probable (see Marquardt, I², p. 384).

[5] Tac. *Ann.* i. 59.

[6] Strab. xii, p. 569 C. [7] *Res gest., etc.*, pp. 172 ff.

[8] At first glance it would seem as if to the passages hitherto examined should be added the statement that Strabo, when a youth, studied at Nysa. Although he mentions the people of this city (xiv, p. 650 C.), he does not speak of that of Rome and Augustus, which is attested by an inscription of 1 B. C. (see *CIG*, no. 2943). This may be due to one of two reasons, one of which is as probable as the other: either Strabo did not return to Nysa at a mature age, in the years when he wrote his Geography, or else his work was first written before the temple of Rome and Augustus was erected.

the reference to the Indian embassy which Augustus received at Samos in 20 B. C.[1] Nevertheless, p. 719 C., where Strabo discusses minutely the gifts brought to Augustus, would seem to belong to a second redaction, commencing with the words: *προσθείη δ' ἄν τις τούτοις καὶ τὰ παρὰ τοῦ Δαμασκηνοῦ Νικολάου.*

The historical works of Nicolaus of Damascus were possibly not known to Strabo till the last years of his life, since the great History of Nicolaus reached at least as far as the death of Herod,[2] and perhaps even farther. That Strabo here added a page to a work which had been written earlier appears all the more probable when we remember that this embassy had already been mentioned by him in another place.[3] Bearing in mind the fact that in this second passage (p. 719 C.) he speaks of himself as having been an eyewitness to some of the things mentioned by Nicolaus of Damascus (cf. p. 706 C.), we are led to the conjecture that in the first redaction of the text he had reference merely to Indian prodigies in the passage in question, adding something of his own to what had been said by his predecessors (of whom the last quoted is Artemidorus), and that, having later chanced upon the work of Nicolaus, who treated more at length of the embassy and of the gifts seen by him at Antioch in Syria, he drew from this author for the inserted page, and added, in the case of the herm, the words "which we ourselves saw."

Book xvi: Syria, Judea, Arabia, and the neighboring regions.—This book also has been revised in places. Strabo records the fact that Commagene became a Roman province,[4] speaks of the family of Herod, king of Judea, and tells of the fate of his sons, one of whom *ἐν φυγῇ διετέλει παρὰ τοῖς Ἀλλόβριξι Γαλάταις.*[5] Since Archelaus was exiled to Vienna in Gallia Narbonensis in 6 A. D., although we have no reference to the date of his death, it is probable that this passage was inserted not much before 18 A. D. We may, indeed, even suspect that the authority for these statements was the History of Nicolaus of Damascus. We also find a

[1] Strab. xv, p. 719 C.; cf. p. 686 C.

[2] See Müller, *F. H. G.*, III, p. 344.

[3] Strab., xiv, p. 686 C.

[4] xvi, p. 749 C.; 18 A. D.

[5] xvi, p. 765 C.

later addition in the passage referring to the wars of the Romans against the Parthians up to the time of Crassus. After narrating the services of Phraates to Augustus, speaking at length of the sending of his sons, Seraspadanes, Rhodaspes, Phraates, and Vonones, as hostages to Rome, and after having asserted that "one may still see at Rome certain of the sons of Phraates, keeping a royal following at the expense of the public treasury"[1]—words which suit the period preceding 8 A. D., after which time Vonones became king of his country[2]—Strabo adds: "And the Parthian kings have always continued to send embassies to Rome and to hold conferences [with the Roman governors of Syria]."[3]

These embassies took place, first, at the time of Phraataces, son of Phraates, who in 4 B. C. sent a legation to Rome to receive back his brothers, and who in 1 A. D. held a conference with C. Caesar on an island in the Euphrates; again, when Vonones was sent by Augustus to the Parthians after 8 A. D.; and, finally, when Artabanus conferred with Germanicus in 18 A. D. on the banks of the Euphrates.[4] The words *οἱ λοιποὶ δὲ βασιλεῖς* lead us to think of at least two of the successors of Phraates. Even on the supposition that Strabo alludes only to Phraataces (died 4 A. D.) and Orodes (4–8 A. D.), we must admit that this passage was added at least twenty years after the time we have established for the first redaction of the text. Since, however, Strabo is cognizant of the measures taken by Germanicus in 18 A. D., it is very probable that he alludes also to the conference of Germanicus with Artabanus, and that he at least refers to the time when Parthia had a king who was friendly to Rome—i. e., Vonones. In the brevity of its references to the relations between the Parthians and Romans after 8 B. C. this passage recalls vividly the analogous descriptions of the relations between the Armenians and Romans after the battle

[1] xvi, p. 749 C.

[2] For the chronology of the events mentioned both here and later I refer to Mommsen, *Res. gest.*, *etc.*², pp. 141 ff.; cf. Gardner, "The Parthian Coinage," in Head, *Hist. num.*, pp. 691 ff. The words of Strabo possibly allude to the deaths of Seraspadanes and Rhodaspes (cf. *CIL*, VI, 1799), which occurred at Rome, but unfortunately we are ignorant of the dates.

[3] Strab. xvi, p. 749 C.

[4] Tac. *Ann.* ii. 58.

of Actium.[1] The first writing of this book, therefore, I believe to have occurred shortly after 8 B. C., at which time the sons of Phraates came to Rome. With this terminus agree the passage relating to the founding of the colony of Berytus,[2] and also the statement in the account of the expedition of Aelius Gallus to Arabia, to the effect that the traitor Sillaeus paid the penalty for his crimes in Rome[3]—an event which took place in 7 B. C.[4] That Strabo really composed this section of his work much earlier is, however, shown by his statement that the village of Egra was in the territory of Obodas,[5] although Obodas, whom he refers to as if still living, died in 7 B. C.,[6] and was succeeded by Aretas IV,[7] a fact of which Strabo is ignorant. Since, in speaking of this Arabian expedition of Aelius Gallus, Strabo says, *στρατεία νεωστὶ γενηθεῖσα ἐφ' ἡμῶν*,[8] we are led to believe that he wrote not only this book, but also book ii, in which this expedition is mentioned as having occurred *νεωστί*,[9] shortly after 25–24 B. C., or, in other words, shortly after the time when the expedition occurred.

Book xvii.—The same holds true for the last book of the Geography, the first portion of which was written not long after the voyage which Strabo undertook in company with Aelius Gallus as far as the confines of Ethiopia (23–22 B. C.), and also not long after the expedition of Gallus against Petronius (23–22 B. C.), and the arrival of the Ethiopian expedition at Samos (20 B. C.).[10] Strabo alludes with a *νυνί* to the three legions which guarded Egypt.[11] This distribution of the legions, however, although true for 20 B. C., does not correspond to the conditions at the time of Tiberius, nor possibly even during the final years of the reign of Augustus, since we know that at that period Egypt was guarded by only two legions, the Third Cyrenaica and the Twenty-seecond Deiotariana.[12]

[1] Strab. xi, p. 332 C.; cf. xi, pp. 515 C., 523 C.; vi, p. 288 C.

[2] 14 B. C.; xvi, p. 756 C.

[3] xvi, p. 782 C.

[4] Flav. Jos. *Ant. Iud.* xvi. 9. 8; xvii. 3. 2; *Bell. Iud.* i. 29. 3.

[5] Strab. xvi, p. 782 C.

[6] See Flav. Jos. *Ant. Iud.* xvi. 9. 4.

[7] Cf. Strab. xvi, p. 781 C.

[8] xvi, p. 780 C.

[9] ii, p. 118 C.

[10] xvii, p. 819 C.

[11] xvii, p. 807 C.; cf. p. 797 C.

[12] See Tac. *Ann.* iv. 5; Mommsen, *Res. gest., etc.*, pp. 68 ff.

On the other hand, the mention of the obelisks which were brought to Rome is in harmony with what we have elsewhere observed regarding the time when the Geography was first put in final form. This event, the most recent indicated in the description of Egypt,[1] is shown by the inscriptions[2] to have occurred before 10 B. C.

The second part of this book (Proconsular Africa and Numidia, Mauretania and the neighboring regions), as I have shown elsewhere,[3] was built up from early geographers, especially Artemidorus, and from the historians of the wars of Jugurtha and Caesar.[4] In it there is no reference to events of the time of Augustus, as, for example, the Augustan colony of 29 B. C. at Carthage, while, on the other hand, the colony planted there by Caesar is mentioned.[5] The one exception to this is the reference to the founding of the realm of Mauretania which was granted to Juba,[6] whose death, indeed, is twice recorded. The death of Juba occurred after the year 18 and before 23 A. D.[7] A reading of this final portion of book xvii leads to the conviction that Strabo commenced writing it not long after 20 B. C. The mention of the death of Juba, who on the final

[1] Strab. xvii, p. 805 C. [2] *CIL*, VI, 701, 702. [3] *Op. cit.*, p. 205.

[4] In my article in *Riv. di filol. class.* (Turin), XV, I noted various passages in book xvii which seemed derived from a work entitled *Bellum Africanum* (e. g., xvii, pp. 831 C. ff.; cf. *Bell. Afr.* 33. 87). Since then Landgraf (*Untersuchungen zu Caes. u. seinen Fortsetzern*, Erlangen, 1888) has shown that this should be attributed to Asinius Pollio. This makes even more evident the relation between this work and Strabo, who cites Asinius as witness both in his Geography (iv, p. 193 C.) and in his History (see Flav. Jos. *Ant. Iud.* xiv. 8. 3). The question remains as to whether Strabo knew of the writings of Asinius at first hand, or through Timagenes, one of his known sources (iv, p. 188 C.; cf. *Ant. Iud.* xiii. 11. 3), and who grew old in the house of Asinius (L. Sen. *De ira* iii. 23). I am inclined to believe that Strabo quoted Asinius on the authority of Timagenes, since he shows neither much knowledge of, nor respect for, the Roman authors (see my *op. cit.*, pp. 103 ff.), and since, in the passage where Asinius is quoted as authority for the length of the Rhine, the distance is given, not in Roman miles, but in stades. When elsewhere Strabo cites a Roman source, such as Artemidorus (cf. v. pp. 224 ff., 261 C.; vi, pp. 266, 277 C.), he gives the distance in Roman miles. Moreover, in the description of Gaul, shortly before the mention of Asinius, his friend Timagenes is quoted.

[5] Strab. xvii, p. 833 C.; 44 B. C. [6] 25 B. C; Strab. xvii, p. 828 C.

[7] I confess to not being entirely convinced by the arguments of a numismatic character (see Müller, *Numis. d'Afrique*, III, pp. 113 ff.) which attempt to show that Juba died in 23 A. D. On the other hand, I see no reason for asserting, with Niese (*Hermes*, XIII, p. 35), that he must have died in 19 A. D.

page of book vi is spoken of as alive (p. 288 C., where he is spoken of as having assumed the rule of Mauretania; 25 B. C.), confirms us in the belief that the two passages, "Juba has recently died, leaving as successor and heir his son Ptolemy, whose mother was a daughter of Antony and Cleopatra,"[1] and "This region . . . . fell to . . . . Juba in our time [the father of Juba II, who recently died],"[2] were retouched and added to after 18 A. D.

To sum up: In the entire Geography there are but two or three passages which allude to events occurring after 7 B. C., and referring to the final years of Augustus; and of these events possibly but one (the games at Naples) has reference to the West.[3] We have also noted about twenty passages which were either worked over or added to at a later period, in which mention is made of Tiberius, or of events occurring in the first years of his reign, and especially in 17–18 A. D. The great majority of these passages are in the books devoted to the description of the eastern provinces, and, although a few are found in book vi, these too refer to the East. Five passages only refer to the West, and of these, two alone refer to special events, such as the death of Juba and the triumph of Germanicus. Of the other three, one makes a vague and general allusion to Tiberius;[4] one, to Tiberius, Germanicus, and Drusus;[5] while one states that thirty-three years had elapsed since the victories of the elder Drusus.[6]

This lacuna between the events occurring before 7 B. C. and after 17 A. D. leads me to believe that the Geography was first written not much later than 7 B. C., and that it was hastily worked over in 18 A. D., or shortly afterward. I do not think, however, that it was originally written within a short space of time. There seems reason to hold that it was begun by Strabo not long after the completion of his historical works, to which the Geography was an appendix and commentary. He expressly states that the

[1] Strab. xvii, p. 828 C. [2] xvii, p. 829 C.

[3] I do not count the two places where Strabo speaks of the family of Herod (died 4 B. C.) and of Athenodorus of Tarsus (alive in 8 B. C.), since these references are closely connected with others referring to an earlier period (see above, pp. 399 f.).

[4] iii, p. 156 C.; see above, p. 389. [5] vi, p. 288C. [6] iv, p. 206 C.

Geography was "on the same plan" as his earlier works, and that, like them, it was written "for the same men, and especially for those who occupy high positions."[1] His greater historical work, which unfortunately has been lost, narrated even the contemporary events down to 27 B. C.,[2] and we may surmise that he set about the compilation of the Geography not much later than that year. In the description of Arabia, and in that of Egypt and Libya, we have noted certain indications which tend to show that the original redaction of the text of these books could not have occurred much later than 20 B. C. This archaic flavor, so to speak, is felt also in the books given up to Italy (v, vi) and to Greece (viii–x), and in the first two books, which serve as preface, and which may have been written not long after 16 B. C.[3] At a later period, certainly not earlier than 9 B. C., Strabo wrote the books dedicated to Gaul and Germany.[4] In general, we have seen that in his Geography Strabo recorded events down to 7 B. C., whether because these had also been treated in appendices to his History, or because—what seems more probable—he considered the Geography an appendix to the History, and in it wished to recount, or at least to enumerate at length, the later events, just as he did in regard to the Arabian and Ethiopian expeditions of Gallus and Petronius (25–22 B. C.), and in the case of the administration of the Gauls under Augustus, Agrippa, Tiberius, and Drusus (27–9 B. C.).

The final page of book xvii, which offers a general survey of the Roman Empire and provinces,[5] would seem to have been written between 22 and 11 B. C., although other arguments would lead us to think that the Geography was not finished till about 7 B. C.

It is not difficult to discover the motives which led Strabo to

[1] i, p. 13 C.

[2] Otto (*op. cit.*, p. 13) thinks that Strabo carried his history down to 27 B. C. This conclusion he bases on the final page of book xvii (p. 840 C.), which alludes to the division of the provinces into senatorial and imperial, and where it is said that in that year Augustus became arbitrator for life in matters pertaining to peace and war. Previous critics (among these Müller, *F. H. G.*, III, p. 490) have thought that the History continued down to 31 B. C.; i. e., to the battle of Actium. It seems to me, however, that the opinion of Otto is preferable.

[3] See above, p. 383, and note 1.

[4] iv, vii; see above, pp. 389, 395.

[5] P. 840 C.

complete his work at that period, and to confine himself to mentioning only the events which took place before that year. Strabo wrote[1] from the point of view of a Greek, and, furthermore, of a Greek from Asia Minor, and probably also from the point of view of an Amasiot. After the battle of Actium, and the subsequent measures taken by Augustus (who visited the eastern provinces in 31–29 and 21–19 B. C.) and by Agrippa (14–13 B. C.), who, among other things, put in order affairs near the Bosphorus, the Greek East was thrown into confusion by the death of Polemon, king of Pontus, Lesser Armenia, and the Bosphorus; and, as is shown by the coins, in the following year the region in which Amasia was situated became part of a Roman province.

After the death of Polemon and that of the last king of Paphlagonia, which bordered on Pontus,[2] no noteworthy event occurred in Roman Asia Minor, with the exception of the death of Herod (4 B. C.), which gave rise to the struggle between his sons,[3] and of the sending of C. Caesar, who died in the midst of his undertaking;[4] and with the further exception of the death of Augustus (14 A. D.), and of the arrival of Germanicus, who was sent there in 18 A. D. with full power as Agrippa and Gaius had been. Germanicus renewed the ancient relations with the Parthians, gave to the Armenians a king who was friendly and subject to the Romans, and incorporated in the empire both Commagene and Cappadocia. The death of Augustus was an event of great importance for the entire empire. With the succession of Tiberius the new political form which had been created by C. Caesar was permanently established. It was this, without doubt, which compelled Strabo to revise his work, if only for the purpose of inserting the name of the new ruler. The passage in which he speaks of the Spanish garrison was worked over, not for the purpose of adding anything new, but merely to make mention of Tiberius.[5] For the same

[1] See my article in *Riv. di filol. class.* XV, pp. 99–122.

[2] Died at about this period; see below, p. 424, note 2.

[3] Strab. xvi, p. 765 C.

[4] Mentioned indirectly by Strabo in speaking of Artagira, xi, p. 529 C.; see above, p. 381.

[5] See above, p. 389.

reason Strabo added the final words of book vi.[1] In like manner the arrival of Germanicus in the East, and the measures taken by him, changed the aspect of a portion of Asia Minor, and especially of the region near Amasia, bordering on the Pontus and Cappadocia. The queen of Pontus, Pythodoris, saw her son, Zenon, ascend the throne of Greater Armenia and Cappadocia, and the realm of her second husband, Archelaus, become a Roman province.

It seems most probable that, just as the death of Polemon and the incorporation of Amasia into the Roman Empire marked the end of the first redaction and first definite arrangement of the text, so the arrival and sojourn of Germanicus in Asia Minor (18–19 A. D.) caused Strabo to take up the work which he had written twenty-five years earlier and to bring it down to date by inserting recent events.

Certainly, if Strabo had not commenced to write his Geography till after 18 A. D., and if he were at that time in Rome, he would not have overlooked the new geographical documents, such as the map of Agrippa, and the recent historical works, such as that of Isidorus of Charax on the Parthians. In reality he was then old, having passed his eightieth year, and naturally lacked the strength and enthusiasm necessary for the composition of the voluminous work which he himself did not shrink from calling "colossal."[2] He, therefore limited himself to mentioning the most important of the events which came to his notice. With a few lines here and there, as in the case of the Armenians and Parthians,[3] he alluded to conditions as they were after 7 B. C., and, when he was able, added a few references to the state of affairs under Tiberius. As we shall see below, he was possibly far from Rome when he revised his work. He was a writer of historical works bearing especially upon the East,[4] which he understood much better than he

[1] See above, p. 392. [2] Strab. i, p. 14 C. [3] See above, pp. 390 f.

[4] This much, it seems to me, may be asserted with certainty. Of the two historical works of Strabo, one treated of Alexander the Great, the conqueror of the East, and the cause of the hellenizing of the interior of Asia Minor; the other described the events which occurred between 146 and 27 B. C., in continuation of the history of Polybius. The numerous historical allusions in the Geography are

did the West,[1] and, in narrating the events of 17–18 A. D., he was naturally cognizant of the most noteworthy events connected with Asia Minor. He therefore recorded the deeds of Quirinius (3–2 B. C.), the death of the Idumean Herod and the rivalry of his sons, and the various events of the year 17–18 A. D., such as the aid given by Tiberius to the Asiatic cities, and the chief measures taken by Germanicus. He does make mention of the triumph of Germanicus over the Germans, but in general the West was, and always remained, less known to him. Even though in the books given up to the description of the West he mentions the new emperor, Tiberius, either his strength failed him, or he was without the more exact information which would have permitted him to go farther into detail. For that reason, in the books in which he speaks of the Germans and Pannonians, he does not mention the deeds of Tiberius, even though he did insert a reference to the triumph of Germanicus. In short, about 18 A. D. Strabo merely retouched a work which described conditions in the empire twenty-five years earlier. This retouching of the Geography occurred simultaneously for all of the books, and probably in a single year. This is shown by the fact that book iv (p. 206 C.) was worked over in 18 A. D.; that at the end of book vi (p. 288 C.) Germanicus is spoken of as alive;[2] and that in book xii (p. 534 C.) Cappadocia is mentioned as having recently become a Roman province (18 A. D.). The reference to the death of Juba alone[3] may possibly exceed this limit. The exact date when this occurred is unknown;[4] but, at any rate, this would be the only page revised after 18 A. D.

We have conjectured that events in Pontus and Cappadocia gave occasion for the first and second redactions of the text of the Geography. This hypothesis is rendered all the more probable by the following examination of the relations which may have existed between Strabo, Amasia, and the kings of Pontus.

for the most part to Alexander the Great or his conquests, to the wars of Mithridates, or to those of Pompey and Caesar in the East, etc. Whoever wishes a proof of this has but to read the collection of Otto, *op. cit.*

[1] See above, pp. 414 ff.

[2] Germanicus died October 8, 19 A. D.; See *CIL*, X, 6638.

[3] Strab. xvii, p. 828 C.

[4] See above, p. 404, n. 7.

II. THE LIFE OF STRABO AND THE PLACE WHERE HE WROTE HIS GEOGRAPHY

Strabo was born at Amasia on the Pontus about 64 B. C.[1] In his youth he heard the readings of Aristodemus at Nysa in Caria.[2] Possibly the turmoils and displacements of interests which occurred in Pontus as a consequence of the victories of Pompey and the overthrow of the power of Mithridates the Great, caused the parents of Strabo, mistrusted by Pompey, to abandon Amasia.[3] Possibly the youthful Strabo was sent to Nysa merely because of the close relations which, even during the reign of Mithridates, existed between the cities of the Roman provinces of Asia and Pontus.[4] At any rate, it is fairly certain that at about the age of twenty, and not merely in 29 B. C., as Niese and others hold, he went to Rome by way of Corinth.[5] Quite possibly it was at that

[1] Concerning the date of Strabo's birth there seems no reason for discrediting the conclusions of Niese (*Rhein. Mus.*, XXXVIII, pp. 567 ff.), who places it in 64 or 63 B. C. No value attaches to the argument advanced by Meyer (*Quaestiones Strabonianae* [Leipzig, 1879], p. 54, n. 14), and accepted by Schröter (*Bemerkungen zu Strabo* [Leipzig, 1887], p. 3), based on the passage where Strabo states that in his time and after the disbanding of the pirates (i. e., 67 B. C.) the dynasty of Teucer reigned in a small part of Cilicia (Olbe). It is true that certain Cilician cities, such as Pompeiopolis (Soli) and Alexandria, date their era from 67 B. C. (Head, *Hist. num.*, pp. 598, 611), but it is also true that Cilicia was reorganized by Pompey in 64 B. C. See Marquardt, *op. cit.*, I², p. 382, n. 7.

[2] Strab. xiv, p. 651 C. extr.

[3] Strabo states that Pompey did not confer on his paternal relations the benefits and favors promised them by Lucullus, on account of their having betrayed Mithridates. He even brought it about that, at Rome and after 62 B. C., the measures taken by Lucullus in favor of his friends in Asia were abrogated by the Senate (xii, p. 557 C.). This is confirmed by the account in Plutarch (*Pomp.* 38; *Luc.* 18). Hasenmüller (*De Strabonis Geographi vita* [Bonnae, 1863], p. 5) attempts to show that these relations were on the father's side. In the phrase ὁ πάππος ἡμῶν ὁ πρὸς πατρὸς αὐτῆς he does not find a corruption of the text, as do the best editors of Strabo, but thinks the word ΑΥΤΗΣ is the name of the paternal grandfather. In general this hypothesis seems correct. If, however, we bear in mind the passage where Strabo mentions the names most common in the regions of Paphlagonia and Pontus on both banks of the Halys, and thus in his own country (xii, p. 553 C.), it seems possible that the name ΑΥΤΗΣ, which really seems corrupt, might be changed to ΑΙΝΙΑΤΗΣ.

[4] See Appendix.

[5] This I have attempted to prove in my *op. cit.*, p. 228. The words εἴδομεν

time (44 B. C.) that he met Servilius Isauricus,[1] who died that same year. Moreover, Strabo was certainly in Rome in 35 B. C., or shortly after,[2] and was also there in 31 B. C. or earlier, because in that year occurred the burning of the temple of Ceres, in which, he says, he saw a painting by Aristides.[3] At this period, possibly shortly after 44 B. C., Strabo heard at Rome the famous grammarian Tyrannio,[4] whom Lucullus had brought to that city in 66 B. C. Some time during the year 29 B. C. Strabo made the voyage from Asia Minor to Corinth, and tells of the fishermen of the island of Gyaros who came aboard his vessel and proceeded to Corinth. These fishermen were ambassadors charged with securing a reduction of the tribute from Augustus, who was on his way to Rome to celebrate his triumph after the victory at Actium.[5] It is generally held that Strabo was also on his way to Rome at that time. This is probable, and it is also possible that he had been at Nicopolis, which Augustus had just founded on account of the recent victory.[6] Several years later we find him in Egypt, where in 25 and 24 B. C. he accompanied Aelius Gallus as far at the Cataracts. It is not true, however, as Niese holds, that Strabo went to Egypt with Aelius Gallus, and returned with him to Rome.[7] Strabo is aware, both of the Arabian expedition of Aelius Gallus and also of the Ethiopian expedition of his successor, Petronius (24–22 B. C.). He speaks with praise, not of the first-mentioned alone, but in general of all the governors of Egypt.[8] The mention

[i. e., Corinth] *νεωστὶ ἀναληφθείσης ὑπὸ τῶν Ῥωμαίων* (viii, p. 379 C.) may easily refer to the year 44 B. C., when the colony was planted. This is shown by other statements referring to the time and place, given in this passage. It may be added that the words *καὶ ἡμεῖς ἀπὸ τοῦ Ἀκροκορίνθου κατωπτεύσαμεν τὸ κτίσμα* make it all the more probable that Strabo saw the city shortly after Caesar planted a colony there.

[1] Strab. xii, p. 568 C.; cf. Cic. *Phil.* ii. 5. 12; Dio Cass. xlv. 16.

[2] The Selurus whom Strabo saw perish at Rome was certainly one of the fugitive slaves who were defeated in Sicily either by Octavianus or by his legates. See Dio Cass. xlviii. 36; xlix. 12; App. *Bel. civ.* v. 72. 132; cf. Oros. vi. 18; 37–35 B. C.

[3] Strab. viii, p. 381 C.

[4] xii, p. 548 C.

[5] x, p. 485 C.

[6] vii, pp. 324 C. ff.; x, p. 450 C.

[7] *Hermes*, XIII, p. 42.

[8] Strab. xvii, p. 797 C.

which he makes of the temple of Ceres at Alexandria,[1] which a recently discovered inscription shows to have been dedicated in 13–12 B. C., formerly led me to believe that he remained at Alexandria until that year.[2] An argument in favor of this hypothesis may perhaps be found in the passage where Strabo describes Egypt. In this he makes mention of two obelisks which were carried to Rome. These were the obelisks dedicated by Augustus in the year 10 B. C.[3] These conclusions, however, have no absolute value. It may be objected that Strabo saw the obelisks raised at Rome, and that he could have spoken of the Καισαρεῖον even before 13 B. C., since it is not necessary to conclude that he saw it completed in every part. At any rate, I think I can show by a new line of reasoning that Strabo remained at Alexandria even after the departure of Aelius, and that the expression ἡμεῖς ἐπιδημοῦντες τῇ Ἀλεξανδρείᾳ πολὺν χρόνον[4] alludes to a period of several years' duration.

In book xv, in connection with the description of Egypt, and on the authority of Nicolaus of Damascus, whom he met at Antioch, Strabo enumerates the gifts sent to Augustus at Samos in 20 B. C. To use his own words, they comprised "a herm, the subject of which had had both arms amputated from its earliest infancy, and which we ourselves have seen at Rome; vipers of very large size; a serpent ten cubits long; a river tortoise of three cubits, etc."[5] Where could Strabo have seen this mutilated herm? Schröter thinks it could only have been at Rome and in the royal palace.[6] A statement of this nature shows a disregard of the passage of Suetonius, where, in speaking of Augustus, it is said: "ludebat cum pueris minutis, quos facie et garrulitate amabilis undique conquirebat precipue Mauros et Syros. eam pumilos atque distortos et omnis generis eiusdem ut ludibra naturae malique ominis

[1] xvii, p. 794 C.

[2] See *Add. ad CIL*, III, 6588; cf. my article in *Riv. di filol. class.* (Turin), XV, p. 229.

[3] See *CIL*, VI, 701, 702.

[4] Strab. ii, p. 101 C.

[5] Strab. xv, p. 719 C.

[6] Schröter, *Bemerkungen zu Strabo* (Leipzig, 1887), p. 7.

abhorrebat."[1] It seems more probable that Strabo saw this herm in Egypt, and very possibly in Alexandria, as may be concluded from a passage in the same description of India. In speaking of the wild beasts of that region, it is said: "Aristobulus states that he was not able to verify in person the dimensions which certain reptiles are reported to attain, and merely says that he saw a female viper nine cubits and one span in length. We ourselves when in Egypt saw with our own eyes a viper of about the same size."[2] A comparison between the two passages makes it more than probable that Strabo was in Egypt at the time when Augustus was at Samos. At the end of the description of the Ethiopian expedition of Petronius, Strabo alludes to this circumstance where he states that the ambassadors sent by Petronius came to Samos, because the emperor was at that time on the island.[3] After 20 B. C., however, Strabo was again in Rome. This is shown, in the description of the city, by the mention of various edifices which were erected later than that year. Thus, the mention of the three theaters refers, in addition to the ancient theater of Pompey, to those of Cornelius Balbus and of Marcellus, dedicated in 13 B. C.[4] There is also mention of the mausoleum of Augustus, the construction of which was fairly well advanced in 12 B. C., and of the portico of Livia, which was dedicated in 7 B. C.

It now remains to decide whether Strabo was in Italy, and at Rome, after this year. The mention of the festivals at Naples,

[1] Suet. *Aug.* 83.

[2] Strab xv, p. 706 C. extr.

[3] xvii, p. 821 C.; cf. Dio Cass. liv. 9. I find an argument in favor of the view that Strabo was in Rome after 24 B. C., and which substantiates the thesis of Niese, in Strabo's account of Athenaeus of Seleucia, who fled with Murena (the one who conspired against Augustus in 22 B. C.). He was arrested with Murena, but was later found innocent and liberated. When embraced by his friends on his return to Rome, Strabo says that he replied by quoting the words of Euripides: ἥκω νεκρῶν κευθμῶνα καὶ σκότου πύλας λιπών (xiv, p. 670 C.). But, aside from the fact that Strabo may have heard of this elsewhere and later, from mutual friends, it should be noted that the line of Euripides makes one suspect that the words εἰς Ῥώμην are erroneous (even Meineke marks them with an asterisk). We are led to surmise that Athenaeus returned to his own country, where he had been at the head of the government, and that we here should read ἐκ Ῥώμης instead of εἰς Ῥώμην.

[4] Dio. liv. 25. 26.

and the description of the triumph of Germanicus, seem to suggest a later visit to Italy. We have seen, however, that the quinquennial festivals of Naples may have been established long before 2 B. C. At all events, as we have already said, Naples was very close to Puteoli, the most important harbor, from a commercial point of view, in the world, and it is not difficult to explain how Strabo, although remaining in Asia Minor, could have received information of games which rivaled the best that Greece could offer. In the same way, even though he remained in Asia Minor, Strabo could have learned all the details of the triumph of Germanicus, since in 18 A. D., Germanicus himself came with a large following to the East, and traversed the majority of the Roman provinces as far as Armenia, the Euphrates, and Egypt. If Strabo was in Rome in 17, and especially in 18 A. D., in which year he at least retouched books iv and xii, why, in speaking of the reign of Maroboduus,[1] does he not allude to the ruin of his state and of his exile to Ravenna —events which also happened in 18 A. D.?[2]

Several noteworthy facts, on the other hand, oppose the theory that Strabo either visited, or dwelt in, Rome after 7 A. D. If he had lived in Italy during the last years of his life, and had there written his Geography, it seems that his work should show some knowledge of the events of that period. Thus the emperor Tiberius is mentioned, but there is no allusion to his Germanic and Pan-

[1] Strab. vii, p. 290 C.

[2] Tac. *Ann.* ii. 62. 63 The work of Linsmayer, *Der Triumphzug des Germanicus* (Munich, 1875), is known to me only through the ample but rather unfortunate summary of Schröter (*Bemerkungen zu Strabo* [Leipzig, 1887]). Of all the statements of this scholar, who attempts to show that Strabo was not present at the triumph of Germanicus, one alone seems to me worthy of attention. Strabo says that Thusnelda, wife of Arminius, with her son Thumelicus, was paraded by Germanicus in his triumph, and that Thumelicus was three years of age (vii, p. 292 C.). Thusnelda, however, had not yet given birth to Thumelicus in the spring of 15 A. D.(see Tac. *Ann.* i. 55, 58). Therefore on the day of the triumph of Germanicus (May 17, 17 A. D.; see Tac. *Ann.* ii. 41) Thumelicus was not more than two years old. It may be that Strabo erred because he was not present, but this argument, although it deserves mention, is of doubtful value. Through an easily understandable error, Strabo may have assigned to the boy the age which he had attained when he revised his work.

nonic expeditions of the years 4–11 A. D.[1] Further, there is no reference to the Gaetulian victories of Cossus (6 A. D.) and the wars of Tacfarinas, which commenced about 17 A. D.; and there is no use made of the map of Agrippa. There is no mention of the division of Italy into fourteen regions. In the description of Arabia and Libya there is no reference to the deeds of the learned King Juba. The fact is that the work on Arabia had been completed before 2 B. C., when Strabo sent it to C. Caesar. In addition, Strabo takes no account of the description of Parthia which had been written by Isidorus of Charax, who had also accompanied C. Caesar to the East. It would have been easy for anyone so desiring to have seen this book at Rome about 18 A. D.[2] It is of no avail to object that the Geography of Strabo is merely an appendix and commentary to his preceding works, and that in this he mentions only those events which were connected with what he had written before, since in every case where he was able to obtain information about recent events, he records them. This is shown, for example, by his mention of the triumph of Germanicus, and of the coming of Zeno to the throne of Armenia. With all the events which occurred in the East Strabo shows himself to be fully familiar; but, aside from this triumph of Germanicus and the death of King Juba (of whom the former came to Asia Minor in 18 A. D., and the latter was related to the courts of Pontus and Cappadocia), he makes no reference to the later events which refer to the West. If Strabo had been in Rome in 18 A. D., he would have corrected the passage in which he asserted that the Elbe had never been crossed by a Roman army, since at that time it had been crossed by Aënobarbus, who owed his triumph to this fact. In like manner, he would not have let the statement stand that the burning of the temple of Ceres had occurred recently, since in 17 A. D. it had already been re-erected by Tiberius. Furthermore, if Strabo had been in Rome in 18 A. D., he could easily have obtained a list of the senatorial and imperial provinces of that period. He would not have contented himself with giving a list of the senatorial provinces as they formerly existed (ἐν ἀρχαῖς), and would not have

[1] Strab. iii, p. 156 C.

[2] See Plin. *N. H.* vi. 141; xxxii. 10.

shown such a lack of knowledge of the imperial provinces, of which he merely says: "[Caesar] dividing them now in one manner, now in another, and always adapting their administration to the present circumstances, etc."[1] Finally, if he had lived at Rome, instead of often confessing his ignorance of the boundaries which in his time were assigned to the various Roman provinces, excusing himself by the pretext that these boundaries varied with great frequency, he would have indicated the administrative divisions which were in force about 18 A. D. It has been suggested that Strabo purposely overlooked these data, because, as he says, he preferred to indicate the divisions formed by nature, rather than those made for administrative purposes.[2] This, however, is irrelevant, since, wherever he was able, he indicated with much detail the administrative divisions of his time also. A conspicuous example and proof of this is his minute description of the political measures taken in Spain, and his statements regarding the administration of Egypt about 20 B. C., and of Cappadocia at the time when it was still governed by kings. If Strabo had been in Rome in 18 A. D., and in the years following 7 B. C., he would certainly have had more than one occasion to indicate the condition of the empire, its military strength and its administrative organization. If such statements are either lacking, or else are antiquated and sporadic, this shows clearly enough that he was far from the capital, and had to make the most of the few facts that came to his notice.

The above observations concerning the place where Strabo composed his Geography lead us to the conclusion that it was originally compiled and completed in a great political and literary center. The various occasions when Strabo visited Rome (at least three), and his long residence at Alexandria (at least five years), gave him the opportunity of consulting the many excellent works which he quotes so freely,[3] and brought to his knowledge

[1] Strab. xvii, p. 840 C.

[2] Strabo declares systematically that he follows the *τόπων φύσις* (e. g., ii, pp. 119 C., 122 C.; vii, p. 289 C.; viii, p. 334 C.; xii, p. 563 C; xiii, p. 581 C.).

[3] This is not the place for discussing the extent to which Strabo had read these authors, and what sources he either really used or else knew indirectly. There exists no good work on this subject. The mere reading of the Geography,

the most important of the political and administrative events of the period.[1] Aside from the few events above noted, the majority of which refer to the years either shortly before or shortly after 18 A. D., and to the eastern provinces, the absence or scarcity of references to events of this late period, taken in connection with the other arguments recently advanced, warrant the belief that during the final twenty-five years of his life Strabo was away from Rome, and resided in some distant city of Asia Minor, possibly his native Amasia, where it was not possible for him to follow political events closely, particularly those which occurred in the West. What he says about the administration of Tarsus is in itself enough to make it appear probable that he dwelt in the East after 7 B. C., since he could have learned these particulars on the spot at the time when Athenodorus left Rome to devote himself to the administration of his own country—an event which certainly occurred in the final years of the reign of Augustus.[2]

The falsity of the opinion of those who hold that the Geography was written at Rome[3] is shown by the extensive travels of Strabo. He boasts of the voyages which he made, and says they were no less extensive than those of his predecessors. He declares that he visited the entire inhabited world, from the shores of the Euxine to the borders of Ethiopia, and from Armenia as far as Populonia

however, gives me the firm conviction that Strabo had read extensively the writings of such authors, and that he does not merely reproduce the text of a few sources, such as Apollodorus and Artemidorus.

[1] The fact that the first edition of the Geography was written about 7 B. C., and that, where Strabo gives the list of the imperial provinces, he is ignorant of the measures which had been taken after 11 A. D., certainly leads to the conclusion that Strabo accomplished the first redaction of his text also when living far from Rome.

[2] See above, p. 399.

[3] The few arguments of a philological nature employed by Niese to show that the Geography was written at Rome, have been confuted by Habler (*Hermes*, XIX, pp. 235 ff.). Strabo says that *νέμεται δ' ἔθνη τὴν Λιβύην τὰ πλεῖστα ἄγνωστα· οὐ πολλὴν γὰρ ἐφοδεύεσθαι συμβαίνει στρατοπέδοις οὐδ' ἀλλοφύλοις ἀνδράσιν οἱ δ' ἐπιχώριοι καὶ ὀλίγοι παρ' ἡμᾶς ἀφικνοῦνται πόρρωθεν καὶ οὐ πιστὰ οὐδὲ πάντα λέγουσι* (ii, p. 131 C.). These words were not composed by a man who wrote at Rome, nor by one writing in Amasia, or some other small and distant city of Asia Minor. Men of every country came to Rome, and certainly Africans did not come to Amasia. At Alexandria, on the other hand, some of the neighboring Libyans must now and then have been seen.

in Etruria.[1] That Strabo exaggerated somewhat in this regard, and that these voyages were not quite so extended as one might be led to believe, has been well brought out by Niese,[2] who, however, does not draw the legitimate conclusions from his own observations.[3] The fact is that Strabo did very little traveling in the West and in Italy itself. As Niese rightly says, we have no reason to believe that he ever visited Sicily or southern Italy. Of Italy, Strabo seems merely to have known the road which leads from Brindisi to Rome, the road between Rome and Naples and Puteoli, and the coast of Etruria between Rome and Populonia.[4]

With these facts in mind, it seems hardly possible that a geographer, historian, and writer such as Strabo, who thought himself the follower and continuer of Polybius, Artemidorus, and Posidonius, could have lived at Rome for any length of time and have there written his books, without embracing the opportunity of visiting the neighboring regions. A Greek philosopher who was on friendly terms with the most famous men in Roman political circles, as Niese holds Strabo to have been, would certainly have had the opportunity of accompanying his friends either to Gaul and Iberia, or to the military provinces of Germany and Illyricum. It was in this manner that he visited the valley of the Nile, and, had the possibility been offered, he would certainly have availed himself of the opportunity of becoming acquainted with Italy, and particularly with Magna Graecia and Sicily, and would have visited Greece, of which it does not seem that he saw anything except Corinth.

Of far more importance were the travels of Strabo in the East. According to his own statements, he ascended the Nile as far as Syene, was present at Comana in Cappadocia,[5] reached the banks

[1] Strab. ii, p. 117 C.

[2] *Hermes*, XIII, pp. 44 ff.

[3] Schröter (*De Strabonis itineribus*, Lipsiae, 1872) makes use of too subjective criteria, and certainly exaggerates the extent of the voyages of Strabo.

[4] It is likewise strange that a geographer who lived many years at Alexandria should never have sought to visit Libya. Strabo's acquaintance with the coast extended merely as far as Cyrene, which he saw only from the sea (xvii, p. 837 C.), possibly on the occasion of a voyage from Alexandria direct to Puteoli (xvii, p. 793 C.). The date of this voyage cannot be determined.

[5] Strab. xii, p. 535 C.

of the Pyramus in Cilicia,[1] and visited Hierapolis in Phrygia,[2] Nysa in Caria,[3] and Ephesus.[4] An attentive reading of his works also brings the conviction that he was acquainted with a large portion of Pontus, and that he may have visited Sinope and Cyzicus in Bithynia, and have seen Nicaea in Cappadocia, traversed Cilicia from one end to the other, and very probably visited Tarsus and possibly Seleucia in Caria. In this last province, too, in addition to Nysa, he certainly visited Milasa, Alabanda, and Tralles, and it seems to me that he must have been acquainted with at least Synnada, Magnesia, and Smyrna. With the exception of the cities on the shore of the Euxine,[5] I have limited myself to the mention either of the cities which Strabo expressly states that he visited, or of those either near or between those which he says that he saw, and the descriptions of which are to be found in the Geography. It is possible that to those mentioned above should be added Berytus in Syria.[6]

From the above it is clear that Strabo traveled much more extensively in the East than in the West. The descriptions of Asiatic and other eastern places are much more accurate and authoritative than those of regions farther west, and seem written by a man who had obtained his knowledge through long-continued residence. It should be noted, however, that neither the eastern nor the western voyages of Strabo are such as one would expect from a man of unlimited means and time, who undertakes to travel for scientific purposes. With the exception of the rather minute descriptions

[1] xii, p. 536 C.

[2] xiii, p. 630 C.

[3] xiv, p. 650 C.

[4] xiv, p. 641 C.

[5] Strabo (ii, p. 117 C.) states that he had been in this region also.

[6] As in the case of Nicopolis (vii, p. 325 C.; x, p. 450 C.), in speaking of Berytus (xvi, p. 756 C.), Strabo makes reference to the territory given to the city by Agrippa, who planted there a military colony in 14 B. C. A reference of the same nature is given for Patrae, which also was founded by Agrippa, and in the same year (viii, p. 388 C.; ix, p. 460 C.). It is quite possible that Strabo derived these statements from literary sources. It should be noted, however, that both Nicopolis and Patrae were on the maritime route between Corinth and Brindisi, and that Berytus was on the route between Alexandria and the Gulf of Issus, where Strabo must have been, since he visited the banks of the Pyramus, and where the road began which ran through Cappadocia by way of Comana (where Strabo also was) to Amasia.

of Lydia and Caria, the accounts of Strabo seem written, not by a person who was traveling on his own account and for scientific reasons, but by a man who seized every favorable occasion to study what circumstances and the pleasure of others gave him the opportunity of knowing. It seems to me that Strabo, to use his own phrase, *τὸν παιδευτικὸν βίον ἑλόμενος*,[1] was at the same time both instructor and politician, and that it was for the sake of others that he made his voyage to Rome and to Alexandria. His first visit to Rome was made in 44 B. C.; the year of the death of Caesar; his second, in 29 B. C., when Augustus was at Corinth, on his way to Rome. Strabo had taken passage, at the time of this second visit, on a ship bound for Corinth, and the same ship was boarded by other ambassadors on their way to Augustus. The year, the place, and the other circumstances cause one to suspect that the journey was made for political purposes.[2] Strabo's voyage to Egypt was made in the company of the governor himself, Aelius Gallus. And that he was instructor of eminent men may also be seen from the Geography, in which Strabo takes especial delight in enumerating all the famous professors who were born, or who taught, in the various cities of Asia Minor which he describes;[3] in which he records his teachers, such as Aristodemus the Younger of Nysa,[4] Tyrannion,[5] Xenocrates,[6] and Posidonius,[7] and his companion as a student, Boetius of Sidon;[8] and in which he also makes mention of those who were teachers of individuals belonging to famous families, such as Aristodemus the Elder, who taught the sons of Pompey,[9] Athenodorus of Tarsus, friend of Strabo, and teacher and counselor of Augustus;[10] Arius, who was likewise the friend of Augustus;[11] Nestor, who taught Marcellus;[12] and

[1] Strab. xiv, p. 670 C.

[2] These travels of Strabo may be compared with those of the rhetorician Potamon, and of the poet Crinagoras of Lesbos (known to our writer, xiii, p. 617 C.), who in 45 and 25 B. C. took part in the political embassy sent from Mytilene to Rome. See Cichorius, *Rom und Mytilene* (Leipzig, 1888), pp. 62 ff., and in the *Sitzungsberichte* of the Berlin Academy, 1889, p. 962; cf. Mommsen, *ibid.*, p. 980.

[3] See the list in my article in *Riv. di filol. class.* (Turin), XV, p. 118, n. 8.

[4] Strab. xiv, p. 650 C.

[5] xii, p. 548 C.

[6] xiv, p. 670 C.

[7] vii, fr. 58, b.

[8] xvi, p. 757 C.

[9] xiv. p. 650 C.

[10] xiv, pp. 674 C. ff.; xiv. p. 779 C.

[11] xiv, p. 670 C.

[12] xiv, p. 674 C.

Apollodorus of Pergamum, who, too, was a friend of the emperor.[1]

After reading this list, one naturally asks whether Strabo did not occupy a similar social position.[2] This supposition is rendered even more probable by the fact that Strabo constantly asserts that his Geography is political, that it is useful for governmental purposes, and that it was written for rulers and those in high positions.[3] If this was the case, it is natural to think that he may have made his travels in company with, and at the expense of certain of these individuals; and it remains to determine who these may have been. Niese has sought to show that they were influential Romans such as Aelius Gallus. In an earlier article[4] I attempted to show the falsity of this opinion, and that Strabo wrote from the point of view of a Greek, and in the interest of Greeks who probably belonged to Asiatic dynasties. I concluded my observations by rather timidly conjecturing that the Geography was composed for Pytho-

[1] xiii, p. 625 C.

[2] The expression used by Strabo in one of his prolegomena (ii, p. 110 C.), where he says that the geographer *κελεύει τε τοῖς προσιοῦσιν*, also tends to show that he was a professor.

[3] E. g., i, pp. 9, 11, 13 C.

[4] I have nothing to add to the observations made in my my article in *Riv. di filol. class.* (Turin), XV, pp. 99–122. It should be noted in this connection that, in attempting to corroborate the opinions of Niese, Butzer (*op. cit.*, p. 30) wrongly makes use of the passage *καὶ τούτων δ' ἔπαυσαν αὐτούς* [i. e., the barbarian peoples of Gaul] *Ῥωμαῖοι καὶ τῶν κατὰ τὰς θυσίας καὶ μαντείας ὑπεναντίων τοῖς παρ' ἡμῖν νομίμοις* (iv, p. 198 C.), since in this and similar passages (cf. ii, p. 131 C.) the "we" means "we Greeks and Romans" (cf. *ἄλλος μὲν Ἰνδοῖς προσήκοι χωρογράφος ἄλλος δὲ Αἰθίοψιν, ἄλλος δὲ Ἕλλησι καὶ Ῥωμαίοις*, i, p. 9 C.); i. e., "we civilized people," in opposition to the barbarians. See, moreover, the final pages of book vi (pp. 287 C. ff.) and book xvii (p. 839 C.), where also the other monarchical states which were subject to Rome are mentioned as part of the empire. Strabo wrote from the point of view of a subject of Rome. He was no less under her control than was a subject of Herod or of Juba, and could therefore say, *ταύτης δὲ τῆς συμπάσης χώρας τῆς ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίοις ἡ μὲν βασιλεύεται, ἣν δ' ἔχουσιν αὐτοὶ καλέσαντες ἐπαρχίαν* (xvii, p. 839 C.). In a short passage from the prolegomena of Strabo, P. Otto, *Leipziger Studien*, XI (sup. vol.), thinks to find a new argument to confirm the thesis of Niese. Had he made a careful examination of the passage in question (as is done in my above-quoted article) and especially of the words which follow it, he would not have so positively asserted that our geographer had merely the Romans in mind.

doris, queen of Pontus. It is true that I had no direct evidence in support of this theory. Since then I have carefully re-examined the works of Strabo, and am persuaded that the many personal or characteristic allusions in his writings are connected either with his previous historical productions or with the history of his life.[1] This leads me again to take up the above-mentioned hypothesis, and to attempt, if not to prove it, at least to show its plausibility.

Strabo, in a noteworthy passage, says of this Pythodoris that she was a "woman of great mental powers, and endowed with veritable administrative capacity."[2] He then gives a short history of her life, saying that she was the daughter of Pythodorus of Tralles. After her marriage to Polemon she ruled some years with her husband, and on his death succeeded him to the throne. Of the three children born from this union, the daughter married Cotys, a Thracian ruler. Strabo mentions the death of this prince and the succession of his son,[3] and says that one of the sons of Pythodoris (Zenon) was recently made king of Greater Armenia (by Germanicus in 18 A. D.), and that the other as a private individual assisted his mother in her government. Finally, we learn from Strabo that Pythodoris contracted a second marriage with Archelaus, the last king of Cappadocia, and after his death remained a widow. We also learn from this long passage that the Tibarenians and Chaldeans, and also Pharnacia and Trapezus, were subject to Pythodoris, and that she ruled over other even more attractive provinces. In an earlier chapter also Strabo[4] alludes to the rule of Pythodoris over the Chaldeans, Trapezus, and Pharnacia; and still later he describes at length, and most minutely,[5] her possessions Pharnacia and Cabires, which she called Sebaste, and where she located her royal seat. He also mentions her possessions Zelitis and

[1] As Butzer (*op. cit.*) and others have noted, the reason that Strabo refers frequently to the revenues of the sacerdotal states—as, for example, Comana—is because on his mother's side (from Dorilaus) he was descended from one of the priests of that temple. To the passages which he mentions should be added that in which Strabo tells the story of Cleon, the former ruler of Juliopolis in Phrygia, who died a priest of Comana (xii, p. 574 C.).

[2] Strab. xii, p. 555 C.

[3] For this ruler see Mommsen, *Eph. epigr.*, II, pp. 254 ff.

[4] Strab. xi, p. 499 C.

[5] xii, pp. 556 C. ff.

Megalopolis,[1] and after these descriptions repeats a third and fourth time that it was to Pythodoris that these various places belonged.[2] In still another passage Strabo recalls the fact that Pythodorus once visited Tralles, and while in that city acquired so much wealth that he was able to pay the fine of two thousand talents inflicted by Caesar, who wished to punish him for his friendship toward Pompey. This, however, did not prevent his leaving great riches to his sons. Strabo then adds: "his daughter is Pythodoris, the present queen, of whom we have spoken before."[3]

In the entire Geography no other ruler is mentioned so frequently as Pythodoris. With the exception of Augustus, Tiberius, and the governors of Egypt, Strabo compliments and eulogizes her alone. The states belonging to this princess, which were near Amasia, and which Strabo possibly saw in person, are described with no less care than are Pontus, Cappadocia, Lydia, Phrygia, and Caria—the regions where Strabo lived and which he knew best. The hypothesis that the Geography was written in the interests of Pythodoris and her family therefore deserves to be at least set forth and discussed.

It is not difficult to discover the occasions when Strabo could have been near this princess. In his youth he studied at Nysa (about 50 B. C.). Thus he was there at the time that Pythodorus of Nysa was living at near-by Tralles, where at about this period he was punished by Caesar (between 48 and 46 B. C.). He had certainly occasion, therefore, to know the father of the future queen of Pontus. On the other hand, Pythodoris, who, as Mommsen has shown,[4] was the daughter of Pythodorus and Antonia (the daughter of Antony the triumvir and Antonia), shortly after 14 B. C. married the Polemon who was the king of Pontus up to 36 B. C., and who in 33 B. C. became king of Lesser Armenia, and in 14 B. C. of the Bosphorus. Polemon and Pythodoris were therefore masters of Pontus, the region where Amasia was situated, and also of Megalo-

[1] xii, p. 559 C.

[2] xii, pp. 559, 560 C.

[3] xiv, p. 648 C. For the story of Pythodoris and Polemon, see the clever observations of Mommsen, *Eph. epigr.*, I, pp. 270 ff.; cf. *CIA*, II, no. 547.

[4] See Mommsen, *loc. cit.*, I, pp. 254 ff.

polis and Zela, which bordered on Strabo's native country. It may, of course, be merely accidental that after his description of the possessions of Pythodoris, Strabo records the history of his own family. There must, however, be some reason for the fact that in speaking of Cabires, where Pythodoris fixed her royal seat, he observes that this was one hundred and fifty stades, or less than twenty miles, distant from Amasia.[1] It seems to me probable that Amasia also was for a time subject to these rulers. It did not become a province until 7 B. C., the year following that of the death of Polemon.[2]

Whatever may be the value of the above conjecture, it is at least certain that Strabo belonged, especially on his mother's side, to an illustrious family which had occupied the highest offices in the realm of Pythodoris. His maternal grandfather, Dorilaus, was priest of Pontic Comana at the time of Mithridates the Great, which

[1] Strab. xii, p. 556 C.

[2] The fact that also Gangra (Germanicopolis) and Andrapa (Neoclaudiopolis) became provincial regions in the same year as Amasia (7 B. C.; see Head, p. 433) led Mommsen (*Röm. Gesch.*, V, p. 298) to suppose that Amasia too belonged to Diotarus Philadelphus, king of Paphlagonia, who had his residence at Gangra (Strab. xii, p. 622 C.). This is not impossible; but it is more probable that Amasia which belonged to Pontus proper (from which Strabo excludes Paphlagonia, pp. 541, 562 C.), was granted to Polemon. This hypothesis receives additional support from an examination of the passage where Strabo, in speaking of the fortress of Sagillum, situated to the west of Amasia, between it and Amisus, relates the visit of Arsaces, and describes how he was besieged by the sons of Pharnaces, and how he was taken prisoner by the kings Polemon and Lycomedes. After narrating the disposition which Pompey made of the Phazemonitis, Strabo concludes; *οἱ δ' ὕστερον βασιλεῦσι, καὶ ταύτην ἔνειμαν* (xii, p. 561 C.); and then goes on to speak of Amasia, saying that *ἐδόθη καὶ ἡ Ἀμάσεια βασιλεῦσι* (*ibid.*). The King Lycomedes here mentioned is certainly the priest of Pontic Comana who was invested with this office by Caesar in 47 B. C. (see *Bell. Alex.* 66), and who is mentioned shortly before by Strabo; and the Polemon is the king of Pontus. This event would seem to have taken place between the time when Pontus was still in the hands of the sons of Pharnaces (one of whom, Darius, was recognized by Antony), and when Polemon had already been nominated king of a portion of Cilicia, and the time when Polemon had already become king of Pontus; or between 39 and 36 B. C. (see App. *Bell. civ.* v. 75; Dio xlix. 25). It seems to me that the words of Strabo *ἐπιτρέψαντος οὐδενὸς τῶν ἡγεμόνων* refer also to the sons of Mithridates, although Meyer holds a contrary opinion (Ed. Meyer, *Gesch. d. Königreichs Pontos* [Leipzig, 1879], p. 109, n. 1; cf. Otto, *op. cit.*, p. 185, fr. 211). However that may be, there is no doubt as to the identification of this Polemon as

means that he occupied the office next to that of king.[1] His maternal uncle, Moaphernes, had been governor of Colchis,[2] and other relatives of his, such as his paternal grandfather and his uncles Tibius and Theophilus, had been powerful leaders, even at the time of Mithridates.[3] Even if the family of Strabo had become of less importance, nevertheless both his calling and his literary and scientific education would surely have enabled him to approach the rulers of his own and of the neighboring states.

If we admit that Strabo came in contact with Archelaus, the second husband of Pythodoris, we may explain why he is always called Strabo "the Cappadocian" by Josephus Flavius,[4] and why

the king of Pontus. It need cause no surprise that, on the death of Polemon, Amasia should have become a Roman province, although the rest of Pontus remained in the possession of Pythodoris. Amasia occupied a strong position from a strategical point of view, since it dominated the valley and the course of the Isis, and its possession was therefore of importance to the Romans. On the other hand, after the battle of Actium had put an end to the civil wars, the Romans seized every propitious occasion for bringing under their sway the possessions of any subject king who happened to die. In this manner Lycaonia (with Iconium) became part of a Roman province, and did not fall to the lot of the heirs, although its king, Polemon, kept it till the year of his death (see App. *loc. cit.;* Strab. xii, p. 568 C.). The fact that Gangra and Andrapa in Paphlagonia were incorporated in the province in the same year as Amasia does not mean that all three places were formerly subject to one and the same prince. Something similar to the events of 18 A. D. may have occurred, when Germanicus had to provide at the same time for the inheritance of Archelaus, king of Cappadocia, of Antiochus, prince of Commagene and of Philopater, ruler over a portion of Cilicia, who died about the same time (see Tac. *Ann.* ii. 42).

[1] Strab. x, p. 477 C.; xiii, p. 557 C.; *Bell. Alex.* 66.

[2] Strab. xi, p. 499 C.

[3] Strab. xii, pp. 557 C. ff.

[4] It may be, of course (see Niese, *Rhein. Mus.*, XXXVIII, p. 582, n. 1), that the term was applied to Strabo because the inhabitants of the Cappadocian Pontus were called simply Cappadocians. Niese quotes especially the author of *Bell. Alex.* 64, where Pontic Comana is called "in Cappadocia." To this passage may be added that of Dio xxxvi, 13, where, in regard to Comana, it is said that there were two cities of that name in Cappadocia, one belonging to Cataonia, and the other to Pontus. Also Strabo, who distinguishes Great Cappadocia from Pontus, speaks of (τὰ) . . . . Καππαδόκων τῶν πρὸς τῷ ἑξῆς μέχρι Κολχίδος (xii, p. 541 C.) and πᾶσα ἡ πλησίον τοῦ Ἅλυος Καππαδοκία ὅση παρατείνει τῇ Παφλαγονίᾳ (p. 553 C.). It may be, too, that the name was given to Strabo on account of his residence in Cappadocia. Thus, to give a single example of a rather common occurrence, Posidonius of Apamea was called "the Rhodian" on account of his sojourn on the island of Rhodes.

he shows himself so well informed concerning this region and its administration; and we also understand better the passages in which he speaks of Herod of Idumea and his family, and where he alludes to the family of Eurycles. The former was the father of the Alexander who married Glaphyra, the daughter of Archelaus; the latter was the principal cause of the death of this Alexander. It may be that these allusions were merely due to the fact that Strabo mentioned these characters in his History. Since, however, Strabo, who did not know of the writings of Juba, and who describes so imperfectly the realm of this king, speaks of his death as having occurred recently, it may be that this was due to the relations which existed between Juba and the court of Pythodoris. Juba had first married Cleopatra, daughter of Antony the triumvir and half-sister of Antonia, the mother of Pythodoris. Later he contracted a second marriage with Glaphyra, daughter of Archelaus and widow of Alexander.[1] Finally, if we grant that Strabo had relations with Pythodoris and her second husband, we find a motive for the fact that, although he makes mention of the siege of Artagira and of Adon, he neither here nor elsewhere speaks of C. Caesar, the son of Agrippa, who was wounded by Adon.[2] Archelaus paid little attention to Tiberius during the time when Tiberius was banished to Rhodes, but was extremely anxious to make friends with his enemy, C. Caesar, when the latter visited the East. After Tiberius succeeded Augustus, he took vengeance by summoning Archelaus to Rome and bringing him to trial. As a result of this trial, and of his other misfortunes, the Cappadocian king finally perished.[3]

The great respect shown by Strabo for Augustus and for Rome,

[1] See Müller, *F. H. G.*, III, p. 466; Mommsen in *Eph. epigr.*, I, p. 276; cf. *CIA*, II, 549.

[2] See above, p. 381.

[3] See Tac. *Ann.* ii. 42; Dio lvii. 17. Those who wish to base on the description of the mausoleum of Augustus (died 14 A. D.), and on that of the triumph of Germanicus (17 A. D.), the conclusion that Strabo was in Rome at that time, might also conjecture that Strabo had accompanied King Archelaus to Rome before 17 A. D., the year when Archelaus died. It is useless, however, to indulge in such pure guesswork. We have already seen that Strabo could have become informed concerning these events, even though he had remained in Asia Minor.

and which he also manifested for Tiberius, agrees perfectly with the condition in which we have supposed that our writer found himself. The attitude of the subject kings was most obsequious toward Rome, and Pythodoris owed her realm as much to Augustus as to Polemon. Nicolaus of Damascus, the historian of Herod, was also the historian of Caesar.

These conjectures concerning the relations which existed between Strabo and the kings of Pontus are of necessity rather problematical. The other conclusions which I have set forth both here and elsewhere are much less uncertain and are, I think, worthy of the closest attention. The Geography, as probably also the historical works, was not written at the instigation of Roman friends and in their interest, but rather from the point of view of a Greek of Asia Minor. It was not necessarily composed at Rome for the first time, and it is hardly possible that it was revised there twenty-five years later. It is much more probable that it was composed from material collected in the two great centers of the civilized world, Alexandria and Rome, and that it was both written and worked over in some distant region of Asia Minor. For this reason the writings of Strabo were unknown to the Roman authors, and particularly to Pliny, who generally showed himself an overzealous reader and compiler of the numerous Greek and Latin works of his time, good, bad, and indifferent. On the other hand, the writings of Strabo were read and praised by Josephus Flavius, a contemporary of Pliny and a purely Asiatic historian.

Niese, in composing his sketch of Strabo, evidently had in mind the figure of Polybius, of whom Strabo was a follower. It seems to me that an even closer resemblance to the character of Strabo is found in the person of another writer of the same period and age, Nicolaus of Damascus, the teacher of the sons of Antony and Cleopatra. This Nicolaus was the political counselor of Herod of Judea, and accompanied this ruler on his Asiatic travels as far as the Pontus, and to Rome, and in his interests, and those of his son Archelaus, several times filled the office of ambassador to Augustus. Of the other contemporaneous historians Strabo

merely mentions the names, without quoting their writings;[1] or else he either entirely overlooks them, or does not allude to their scientific activity.[2] In many places in his Geography, on the other hand, he follows closely the writings of Nicolaus of Damascus,[3] and both quotes him as authority and gives his words, even in regard to events of which he himself was to some extent a witness.[4] From these considerations it seems quite possible that between these two men, who followed the same calling, and who seem to have occupied a similar social and political position, there may also have existed personal relations.

[1] E. g., Dionysius of Halicarnassus (xii, p. 656 C.).

[2] Such as King Juba, Diodorus Siculus, Isidorus, and others.

[3] See Flav. Jos. *Ant. Iud.* xiv. 6. 4; cf. xiii. 12. 6; xiv. 4. 3.

[4] Strab. xv, p. 719 C.

APPENDIX

I cannot resist the temptation of setting forth two rather bold conjectures concerning the life of Strabo. Even daring conjecture, if not presented in a false light, may be of use in the formation of more fortunate, or less uncertain, conclusions.

I. I have above (p. 410) alluded to the motives which led the youthful Strabo to study at Nysa in Caria, and remarked that possibly this was due to the numerous relations which existed between the Roman province of Asia and the Pontus, even at the time of Mithridates, who invaded Bithynia and this region. It is worthy of note that both Polemon and Pythodoris, the future rulers of Pontus, were born in this province; that Diodorus of Adramyttium in Mysia died at Amasia;[1] that the neighboring Ephesians, for commercial reasons, pushed to the very center of Cappadocia; and that, in general, their city was the leading emporium for the commerce with the interior of the Orient, especially for Asia to the west of the Taurus.[2] Of great importance in this connection is the following circumstance: When, in 88 B. C., Mithridates ordered the killing of all the Roman citizens in Asia, the inhabitants of Tralles near Nysa did not themselves spill any Roman blood, but employed for this purpose a captain whom both Appian[3] and Dio[4] call Theophilus of Paphlagonia. This individual, according to all probability, was a partisan of Mithridates, and together with him had invaded the Roman territory. Furthermore, all of the ancestors mentioned by Strabo are presented by him as in the army, and as officers under Mithridates. These are Dorilaus the Younger and Moaphernes, and also his paternal grandfather (Aeniates ?, p. 410, note 3), his cousin Tibias, and Theophilus, who was the son of Tibius, and therefore a cousin of Strabo's father. Mithridates caused both Tibius and Theophilus to be put to death,[5] and as a result Strabo's grandfather betrayed the king and went over to Lucullus and the Romans (after 73 B. C.). It seems quite possible that this Theophilus was the same person as the Theophilus who was hired by the inhabitants of Tralles. The only objection is that the individual recorded by Appian and Dio is said to have come from Paphlagonia, and not from Pontus; and this is easily explained. According to Strabo, the inhabitants of both banks of the Halys, in the lower part of its course, belonged to a single ethnographical stem, and were, in the last analysis, Cappadocians. For this reason the same proper names were in use in the various regions of both eastern Paphlagonia and western Pontus. Among these Strabo mentions that of Tibius,[6] which was also the name of the father of his uncle Theophilus;

[1] Strab. xiv, p. 614 C.

[2] Strab. xii, pp. 540, 577 C.; xiv, pp. 641, 663 C.

[3] *Bell. Mithr.* 23.

[4] Fr. 101.

[5] Strab. xii, p. 557 C.

[6] xii, p. 553 C.

and it is not at all surprising that Theophilus of Tralles, although really from Pontus, should have been called a Paphlagonian, or that Strabo should have had relatives even in the region beyond the Halys. The author of the *Bellum Alexandrinum* 66, says that Lycomedes, who was descended from the kings of Cappadocia, and who was made priest of Comana by Caesar, was a Bithynian, and the same author places the Comana of Pontus in Cappadocia. If the same Theophilus is referred to in both of these instances, we understand why Strabo or his family should have established themselves at the gates of a city where a member of the family was holding a high office.

II. In two important chapters Strabo[1] boasts that among his ancestors were Dorilaus the general and Dorilaus the Younger, nephew of the general and friend of the great Mithridates, and known to those writing on the wars of Mithridates.[2] Cicero, in his oration in defense of King Diotarus, says: "corpora sua pro salute regum suorum hi legati tibi regii tradunt, Hieras et Blesaminus et Antigonus tibi nobisque omnibus iam diu noti, eademque fide et virtute praeditus Dorylaus, qui nuper cum Hiera legatus est ad te missus cum regum amicissimi tum tibi etiam ut spero probati."[3] Was this Dorilaus a descendant of those already mentioned, and therefore a distant relative of our geographer? The name is not common enough to make an accidental resemblance probable. In confirmation of this hypothesis it may be noted that, according to Strabo, the Gallic Trocmi held a part of Pontus,[4] and that a portion of the region situated between Amisus and Amasia had been granted to Amasus, but that Pompey gave it to Diotarus καθάπερ καὶ τὰ περὶ Φαρνακίαν καὶ τὴν Τραπεζουσίαν μέχρι Κολχίδος καὶ τῆς μικρᾶς Ἀρμενίας.[5] Immediately following this comes the statement that Diotarus took the name of king and also the paternal tetrarchy over the Gallic Tolistobogi. This shows that our Diotarus is the one in question, and that he ruled, if not over Amasia, at least over the neighboring regions. We should thus have an explanation of the fact that a descendant of Dorilaus had relations with the king and tetrarch of Galatia.

[1] x, p. 477 C.; xii, p. 557 C.

[2] Cf. App. *Bell. Mithr.* 17, 49; Plut. *Sull.* 20; *Luc.* 17; Memn., n. 33, in *F. H. G.*, III, p. 562.

[3] Cic. *Pro Deiot.* 41; 45 B. C.

[4] Strab. xii, p. 547 C.

[5] xii, p. 567 C.

INDEX

INDEX

Acerrae, possible Umbrian origin of, 174 f.

Aeneas, myth of localized in Italy, 186; at Rome, 236

Aënobarbus, crossing of Elbe by, 381

Agathocles, 247, 290 f., pretended expedition against Φοινίκη, chap. xiv; similarity to expedition against Herbita, 160 f.; Adriatic policy of, 291

Ageladas, statue by at Delphi, 34, n. 1

Agrarian laws, pretended agitation against in fifth century, 279

Agrigentum, rival of Syracuse, 29

Agrippa, map of, 385 f.; not used by Strabo, 385; portico of not mentioned by Strabo, 393 f.

Agyrium, coins from, 125

Alexander of Epirus, expedition of to Italy, chap. viii; uncertainty of information concerning, 99; confused with Archidamus of Sparta, 100; real purpose, 102 ff., 109; failure to form state in Apulia, 104; plan to secure all of southern Italy, 105; defeat of Samnites, 106; march to Pandosia, 107; death, 108; unimportant results, 110

Alexandria, 230; date of Strabo's visit, 412

Alipha, known only from Campanian coin, 164; endurance of native element in population, 177

Alliba, known only from Campanian coin, 164

Alybas, 51

Amasia, 407, 410; probably subject to Pythodoris, 424

Aminaeans, location of in Italy, 315, n. 5

Amyris, of Siris, sent to Delphi, 79

Anna Perenna, 248 f., 341, n. 1

Apollo, introduction of cult to Rome, 337

Appian, error in concerning the *Bellum Perusinum*, chap. xxiv

Archaic, head, possibly from Temple of the Sirens, 213 f.; inscription from Sardinia, 374 ff.

Archelaus, 426

Archidamus of Sparta, 349; confused with Alexander of Epirus, 100

Archilochus, visit to Siris, 74

Archons at Naples, 325 f.

Ardea, 274

Argives, 239, n. 3

Armenians, called Parthians by mistake, 390 f., 397; date of mention by Strabo, 391 f.

Arno, 364

Assinaria, festival of, 151

Assinarus, defeat of Athenians at, chap. xiii; same as modern Tellaro or ancient Helorus, 149 ff., 155, 155, n. 2

Astylus, 43 f.

Asylum, right of, 273; Greek institution, 263; connected with tribunate, 263 f.

Athena, cult of at Naples shown by coins, 218; temple of on Sorrentine peninsula, 222 f.; cult substituted for that of Sirens 230; maritime character 223, 229; cult of at Syracuse, 229

Athena Siciliana, cult of, 217 ff.; due to influence of Syracuse, 222; connected with cult of Athena on Sorrentine peninsula, 228

Athenaeum of Punta della Campanella, 217 ff., 222

Athenians, defeat of at Assinarus, chap. xiii

Athenodorus, mention of by Strabo later addition, 399

Atiḍḍaru, equivalent to Assinarus, 155

Augustus, games in honor of at Naples, 394 f.; visit to Samos, 412

Ausonia, chap. i; extension of name, 8; region bounded by Apennines, 10

Ausonians, chap. i; origin of, 12; name preserved in modern names of rivers, 2, 6, 7, 24

Baton, 382

Beneventum, in Ausonia, chap. i

Boreontini, division of Samnites, 5, 6

Brindisi, attacked by Alexander, 102; rival of Tarentum, 102

Bruttium, condition at time of Alexander, 105
Buildings, styles of at Rome, 321

Cacus, 338
Cacyparis, same as Cassabile, 148
Caere, in Ausonia, 9
Caesar, C., silence of Strabo concerning, 381, 407, 426
Calchus, legend of in Cornelius Gallus, 168; not same as Calchas, 168; probably allusion to Daunians of Campania, 170
Cales, in Ausonian territory, chap. i
Caltagirone, discovery of Greek relief at, 131 ff.; situation of, 134
Camillus, L. Furius, victories over Gauls 353 f.
Campania, otherwise unknown cities shown by coins, 164; inferior development of southern portion even today, 179; importance of influence on Rome 341 f.; unit of measure same as at Rome, 316
Campanian elements in Roman history, chap. xxi
Cappadocia, description of in Strabo, 398 f.
Capri, exchanged for Ischia by Augustus, 210
Carthage, 290, n. 2; commercial relations with Italy, 202 f.
Casmenae, secession to, 246
Cassius, Sp., 258 f., 275 ff.; dedication by of temple of Ceres, 245; condemnation of, 253; consul, 258 f.; tribune of plebs, 258 f.; treaty of with Latins, 275 f.
Castle of Ischia, site of fortress of Hiero, 194 ff.; strategic importance of, 194; same as *Castrum Gironis*, 195 f.
Castor and Pollux, 253, 322 f.; cult of aristocratic origin, 257
Castrum Gironis, same as Castle of Ischia, 195 f.
Catana, 29
Cato, 307
Cavalry, Roman, borrowed from Greeks, 322, n. 3; late introduction of, 324
Censors, institution of probably borrowed, 327; in Sicily, 317, n. 1
Cephalus, myth of, 252
Ceres, 272; and Roman secessions, 245 ff., 252; protecting goddess of plebs, 245, 257, 273, 309; location of temple, 246; cult introduced from Sicily, 250 f.; rival to that of Castor and Pollux, 257; burning of temple in 31 B. C., called "recent" by Strabo, 384; temple of in Alexandria, 412
Cestius Macedonicus, 367
Chalcidian ware, possibly derived from Ischia, 188
Chaones, of Epirus, 12; migration to Italy, 71
Charondas, 331 f.
Chones, 2, 5, 13; earliest inhabitants of Siritis, 70 f.
Cimbri, 395 f.
Cincinnatus, L. Quinctius, 282 f.
Circe, and Calchus, 168 ff.
Claudius, Appius, censorship of, 292, 338, n. 1
Clay industry, importance of to Ischia, 187
Cleonymus, expedition of to Italy, in Livy, 90 f.; in Diodorus, 93 f.
Codes, early, 332 ff.
Coinage, imitation by Rome of Campanian, 317 f.
Colophon, 73 f.
Column, ancient, near river Tellaro, 151 f.; excavations at, 156, n. 4
Copper, importance of in Italy in early times, 318 f.
Corcyra, seized by Cleonymus, 94
Coriolanus, 278, 281; improbability of information concerning, 281 f.
Cramones, division of Samnites, 5 f.
Croton, 4, 30
Cults, Greek, introduction to Rome, 256, 336 ff.
Cumae, 269 f.; first Greek colony on mainland, 182
Customs, various Italiot at Rome, 320 f.

Daedalus, 171, n. 1
Damasus, of Siris, 77
Damophilus, 251, 272
Dante, mention in of Arno, 364 f.; of Porta Sole at Perugia, 369
Daunians of Campania, chap. xv; mentioned by Polybius, 163; allied with

Etruscans, 165 f.; of Iapygian descent, 107; found early in Latium, 167; location of, 170 f.; traces of in valley of Sarno, 178 f.
Demaratus, legend of connected with Rome, 241, 308
Demarchs, at Naples, 325 f.
Demeter, cult at Gela, 243 f.; at Syracuse, 247; associated with Dionysus, 250, 314
Diana, introduction of cult at Rome, 336, n. 3
Dio, account in of burning of Perugia, 367
Diodorus, trustworthiness of, 259
Diomede, 5
Dionysius I, expedition of as far as Corsica, 268, 293; Adriatic policy, 293, 298 f.; alliance with Gauls, 294 f., 298
Dionysus, associated with Demeter, 250, 314
Diotarus, 430
Dis, introduction of cult to Rome, 337
Domitia Calliste, inscription of, 217, 227
Dorians, difference between Doric and Ionic systems of colonization, 120; influence of on Etruscan architecture, 270
Dorilaus, 430
Drusus, Germanic expeditions, 395 f.
Ducetius, 284, n. 2; plan to found rival empire to Syracuse, 127

Echetla, probably in eastern Heraeans, 136, n. 2
Education, lack of provision for at Rome in early times, 134 f.; superiority of Greeks in, 334 f.; compulsory at Thurii, 335
Ἡγεμών, use of word by Strabo, 388
Elba, Syracusan fleet at, 220; mines of, 263, n. 2
Elbe, crossed by Romans, 381 f., 387; not crossed by Drusus, 396
Elymians, same as Sicani, 111; of Aryan descent, 115
Enna, seat of cult of Demeter, 251, n. 4
Ennius, 340 f.
Epidius, legend of, 49
Ergetium, coins probably from, 117 f.; exact location uncertain, 118 f.; probably near Laestrygonii Campi, 119
Erineus, same as Fiume di Noto, 149 ff.
Ερυξ, form of the same name as Ἐρύκη, 112
Eryce, form of same name as Eryx, 112 f.; near lake of the Palici, 137
Eryx = Verruca(?), chap. ix; Phoenician and Libyan elements in population, 115
Etruscans, 287; invasions of, 19, 34, 165 f., 176; allied with Umbrians and Daunians, 165 f.; aided by Hiero, 234; enemies of Syracuse, 268; Dorian influence on architecture of, 270; conquest of Pisa, 356 f.
Euboeans, presence of in Siritis, 76
Eurycles, 396
Euthymus, legend of, chap. iii, 39 ff.; statue of at Olympia, 40
Excavations, important field for in Latium, 308, 340; on Sorrentine peninsula, 232

Factory, Phocaean at Pisa, 357 f.
Fasti, late compilation of, 277
Fenser, 173 f., 176; probable location of, 174; endurance of native element in population, 177
Fleet, supposed Greek of 349 B. C., chap. xxii; probably Phocaean mercenaries, 352 ff.
Fortress, of Hiero, on Ischia, 190 ff.; probably located at Castle of Ischia, 194 ff.
Forum, early relations with Greece shown by recent excavations in, 344
Frontier, of Italy, before Sulla, 364 f.

Galarina, location of, 142 f.; near Morgantina, 143 f.; possibly at S. Mauro, 144
Gallus, Aelius, allusion to Arabian expedition of in Strabo, 387; voyage of Strabo with, 403, 411
Games, quinquennial, institution of at Naples, 394 f.
Garganus, Mount, 5, 6; isolated position of, 172
Gauls, accounts of taking of Rome by, 292 ff., 353 f.; accounts preserved by Greek historians, 293; supposed alliance of with Dionysius I, 294 f., 297 f.

Gela, 270; Greek relief of S. Mauro derived from, 134; situated between Sicani and Siculi, 138; secession from, 243 f.

Gelo, 42, 254 f.; quells secession at Syracuse, 246; tomb of, 271, n. 1; resemblance of to Publicola, 285, n. 2

Genua, an Italic name, 114

Geography, Historical, of Strabo, 379 ff.; probably written before 5 B. C., 381 ff., 385; retouched later, 382 f., 389, 405; age of Strabo when written, 386

Geomori, 246 f.; resemblance of secession to that of plebs, 247

Germanicus, account of triumph of added later by Strabo, 382; arrival of in Asia Minor, 407 f., 414

Gladiators, possibly introduced to Rome from Campania, 324 f.

Gold, never found on Ischia, 183 ff.; in Italy, 318 f.; little in early times, 318 f.; use of at Rome, 320, n. 1.

Grain, Sicilian, connected with Roman secessions, 253 f.; caused introduction of cult of Ceres and tribunate, 273; connected with pretended agrarian agitation of fifth century, 279; Campanian, dependence of Rome upon, 308 f.

Greece, influence of on civilization of Rome, 304 ff.

Helorus, another name for Assinarus 153 f.; also called Herbessus, 154; modern Laufi, 154

Hera, associated with Vulcan at Perugia, 367 f.; location of temple, 369

Heraclea, founding of, 67

Heracles, myth of, localized in Italy, 186; at Rome, 236, 338 f.

Heraclides, 324

Heraean Mountains, reasons for expecting traces of antiquities among, 132

Heraeans, mentioned in inscription from Sardinia, 371 ff.; probably an association of dramatic actors, 373

Heraeum, in Sardinia, 371 ff.

Hercules, see Heracles

Hiero, 29; presence of on Ischia, 183, n. 1, 190, 220; location of fortress of, 190 ff.

Hipponium, 31; sacred grove near, 43

Hyperboreans, gave rise to word "aborigines," 299

Hyria, in Campania known only from coins, 164, 172, 176; name characteristic of Iapygian race, 171 f.; regions where found, 171 f.; Campanian city possibly Daunian, 172 f.; location, 174; endurance of native element in population, 177

Iapygians, invasions of, 2, 7, 8, 19

Imhoof-Blumer, observations of on coins of Exgetium, 121

Inscription, Greek from Ischia, 190 f.; later than time of Hiero, 194; Latin from Naples mentioning Athena Siciliana, 217; Greek from Sardinia, 371 ff.; archaic from Sardinia, 374 ff.

Ionians, difference between Doric and Ionic systems of colonization, 120

Ischia, early history of, chap. xvi; site of first Greek factory in Italy, 181; fertility of, 183 ff.; gold mines probably error, 183; importance of clay industry, 186 ff.; strategic importance 189 f.; volcanic activity, 199 f.; relations with Africa, 201 f.; and Naples at time of Sulla, 205 ff.; probably in possession of Naples till 82 B. C., 206 f., exchanged for Capri by Augustus, 210

Islands of the Sirens, 222; termed *li Galli*, 215

Italia, extension of name, 15, n. 1, 17; different meanings of word, 328

Italiot civilization, reason for decay, 109 f., 339; influence of on Rome, 340, chap, xxi; elements of in Roman history, 340, chap. xxi

Italus, leader of Oenotrians, 13 f.

Italy, frontier of before Sulla, 364

Juba, death of in Strabo, 383, 404, 426; mention later addition, 404 f.; connection with court of Pythodoris, 426

Juno, Argive, on Campanian coins, 173; temple of, near Paestum, 173; introduction of cult to Latium, 336, n. 3

Jupiter, connected with Ceres and tribunate, 264

Καλλικύριοι, 246, n. 3, 255, n. 4

Lacco, early remains at, 196 f.

Lamato, 53

Laterni, 6
Latins, treaty of, with Sp. Cassius, 275 ff.
Latium, part of Opician territory, 11; important field for excavations, 308, 340; dependence upon Etruria and Campania for agricultural supplies, 308; supposed Greek pirates off coast of, chap. xxii
Leontini, 29
Leucothea, cult of near Naples, 231
Ligea, 55
Ligurians, same as other Italic peoples, 111, 114; original possession of Pisa by, 356 ff.; recapture of Pisa by, 360 f.; civilization of in second century, 361; strong by sea, 362; later used by Romans against Gauls, 363
Liparaeans, 224, 344; allies of Syracuse, 225, 268
Liparus, myth of, 223 f.; territory ruled by sons of, 223 f.
Livy, synchronisms in, 296, n. 1; possible dependence upon some Campanian writer, 342; account in of Greek fleet of 349 B. C., 345 ff.; duplications in, 353 f.
Locri, hostile to Regium in 473 B. C., 31
Lucullus, villa of, 208
Luna, 361; capture by Ligurians, 362

Mactorium, possibly situated at Mazzarino, 139; secession of Geloans to, 243 f.
Magna Graecia, mixed elements in cities of, 80
Magra, 365
Marica, 1, n. 1
Maroglio, valley of, 134
Marsyas, symbol of liberty, 264 f., 328; identified with Silenus, 265
Mausoleum, of Augustus, date of mention by Strabo, 392 f.
Melius, Sp., 282
Menenius Agrippa, and secessions of plebs, 241 f.; legend repetition of that of Telines, 248 f., 256
Mesma, 31
Metapontum, 351; dependence upon Tarentum, 30, n. 1; alliance with Alexander, 103
Metapontus, myth of, 68
Metics, 263, n. 3
Mezentius, legend of, 314 f.
Micythus, 27, 37; colony founded by at Pyxus, 85
Minae, 137, n. 1
Monte di Vico, inscription of, 190 f.; not site of fortress of Hiero, 194 f.; site of city of Pithecusae, 196 f.
Morgantina, not at Mount Judica, 139; on summit of Heraeans, 139 f.; not at Caltagirone, 141; possibly at Terravecchia, 141
Morges, 13
Morgetians, modern traces of name, 23

Naevius, 342
Naples, date of founding of, 191 f.; coins of, 191 f., 218 f.; and Ischia at time of Sulla, 205 ff., 226; condition after Sulla, 211; cult of Athena at, 218; quinquennial games at, 394 f.
Naxos, 29; likeness of coins to coins probably from Ergetium, 117 ff.; aided by Ergetium in 425 B. C., 119 f.
Neapolis, 331
Neapolitans, on Ischia, 189 ff.; inscription referring to, 190 f.
Nebrodes, 127; possibility that Piacus was located there, 127 f.
Netum, 150
Νεωστί, use of by Strabo, 383 ff.
Nicias, defeat of at Assinarus, 147 f.
Nicolaus of Damascus, followed by Strabo, 401, 427 f.
Niebuhr, theory of concerning Greek fleet of 345 B. C., 349
Nitrioli, 200
Nola, an Ausonian city, 2, 81; coins of with Greek legends 81; coins of, 172 f., 176; Greek character of civilization, 177; probable existence of earlier city, 178
Nuceria Alfaterna, name possibly of Umbrian origin, 166
Nuraghi, 171, n. 1
Nysa, visited by Strabo, 410, 423, 429

Ocinarus, river, mentioned by Lycophron, 55
Ocresia, 113
Oenotria, extension of name, 16
Oenotrians, chap. i; origin of, 16
Oil, see olive

Olive, probable early existence of in Italy, 310 f.; shown on Apulian coins, 311; scarcity in Latium, 312; cost at Rome and at Athens, 312 f.

Omphace, town of Sicani, 138

Onatas, 35, n. 1

Opici, division of Samnites, 5 f.

Opicians, chap. i

Orion, Mount, 5

Oristano, 375

Oscans, traces of Etruscan influence on alphabet of, 178 f.

Osento, 7

Paestum approached by sea by Alexander, 106; survival of mint of, 318

Palice, founding of confused with moving of Minae to plain, 137, n. 1

Pandosia, 16, n. 3, 71; coins of showing alliance with Croton, 81; death of Alexander at, 108

Parthenope, 227

Parthians, 390 f., 397

Patrae, 396

Patrons, 289, n. 3.

Pausanias, legend of Euthymus in 39 ff.

Pelasgians, in Epirus at early date, 71; in Italy, 71

Perugia, error in Appian concerning war of, 367 ff.; account of burning in Dio, 367

Petalism, 279, 282; connection with institution of decemvirate, 280

Peucetians, derivation of name, 15

Phalaecus, expedition of after Sacred War, 348 f.; defeat of, 349; fate of mercenaries of, 349 f.

Phalanx, Greek, in Roman military system, 322

Pharsalia, 350

Phayllus, 268

Philistus, original source of later historians, 295

Philomelus, 350

Phistelia, known only from Campanian coins, 164

Phocaean, mercenaries, in Italy, 352 ff.; factory at Pisa, 357 f.; coins found on coast of Etruria, 359

Φοινίκη, pretended expedition of Agathocles against, chap. xiv

Φοῖνιξ, real object of expedition of Agathocles, 158 f.

Phraates, sending of sons to Rome, 402

Piacus, chap. xi, 126 ff.; coin of, 124; probable location of in Nebrodes, 124 f.; rebuilt after capture, 128

Pisa, early history of, chap. xxiii; an Etruscan city, 355 ff.; originally Ligurian, 356 ff.; not a colony of Pisae in Elis, 358; alliance with Rome, 363 f.

Piso, mentioned in Strabo, 387; not governor of 1 B. C., 387 f.

Pithecusae, derivation of name, 185 f.; probably at Monte di Vico, 196 f.

Pizzofalcone, site of Villa of Lucullus, 208.

Pizzuta, ancient column termed, 151 f., 152, n. 1

Polemon, 423

Polyaenus, account of stratagem of Agathocles in, 157 ff.

Pompeii, traces of Etruscans at, 174, 178

Populonia, 358 f.

Porta Sole, 369

Pozzuoli, superiority over Naples for naval arsenal, 209; benefited by Sulla, 210

Προστάται τοῦ δήμου, at Syracuse, institution of, 261; gave rise to tribunate, 259 ff.

Protagoras, 332

Provinces, list of in Strabo, 382 f.

Punta della Campanella, Athenaeum of, 217 ff.; importance of possession to Naples, 227; maritime character of cult, 229 f.

Pyrgi, plundered by Dionysius I, 269

Pythagoras, statue of Euthymus by, 40; statue of Astylus by, 43; statue of in Rome, 268

Pythodoris, 407, 421 f.; mention of later addition of Strabo's, 399; life of in Strabo, 422

Pythodorus, 423

Pyxus, colony of Regium at, 32, 37; alliance with Siris, 82 f.; advantage to Siris, 84; history of in fifth century, 85

Quinctius, Caeso, improbability of process against, 281

Quinctius, D., 87

Regium, alliance with Tarentum against Iapygians, chap. ii

Relief, Greek, from S. Mauro, 131 ff.; description, 133; product of Dorian art of Gela, 134; material, 135 f.

Relief, Sardinian, with inscription, 372; probably of Greek origin, 373

Rome, alliance with Alexander against Samnites, 106 f.; termed a "Greek city," 292, 318; coins with Greek types, 292, 318; accounts of capture by Gauls, 292 f.; importance of at end of fifth century, 234; friendly relations with Syracuse, 234; elements in history borrowed from history of Syracuse, 235 ff.; according to Dionysius early occupied by Siculi, 237; theory due to early commercial relations, 238; falsity of history up to fourth century, 284 f.; false accounts borrowed, 286; influence of Greece on civilization of, 304 f., 343; slow to admit such influence, 305 f.; similarity of certain coins to those of Campania, 317 f.; features of military system borrowed from Greeks, 322 f.; description of by Strabo, 392 f.

S. Lorenzo, substituted for Vulcan, 369

S. Maria della Lobbra, near Sorrento, 213; festival of, 216

S. Mauro, Greek relief from, 131 ff.; situation of, 134; probably Geloan outpost, 135; ancient name, 136 ff.; possibly Galarina, 144

S. Restituta, cult of on Ischia and at Naples, 197, 228

Samnite elements, in Roman history, chap. xxi

Samnites, invasions of, 19; defeated by Alexander near Paestum, 106; wars of sustained by Tarentum, 323

Samos, visit of Augustus to, 412 f.

Sapriportem, probably error for *ad Satyri portum*, 87

Sardinia, two Greek inscriptions from, 371 ff., 374 ff.; Carthaginian domination of, 377 f.; known to Greeks at least in sixth century, 377; archaeological material of, 378

Sardus, 376

Sarno, valley of, traces of Daunians and Umbrians in, 178 f.; inferior development of inhabitants of even today, 179

Saturn, image of a Rome filled with oil, 313; rites Greek, 313

Saturo, Torre di, 88

Satyra, legend of, 88

Satyrium, harbor of, chap. vi; location of, 88 f.; near Tarentum, 89

Scandula, 321

Scylacine Gulf, called Terinaean by Thucydides, 56

Secessions of plebs, 241 ff.; first secession legendary, 242 f., 243, 249, 254; derived from Gela, 243 f.; introduction of connected with cult of Ceres, 252

Selurus, 384

Sergentium, or Ergetium, coins from, 117 f.; likeness to coins of Naxos, 118

Sicani, of same race as Siculi, 138; inhabited different region, 138

Siceliot elements, in early Roman history, chap. xx, 259 ff., 267 f.

"Sicilian," places termed in Italy, 294, n. 1, 299 f.

Sicily, at time of Timoleon, 317 f.

Siculi, good relations of with Chalcidio-Ionian cities, 120; hostility of toward Syracuse, 120, 150, n. 4; possible location of certain cities of among Heraeans, 132, 136 ff.; same race as Sicani, but inhabited different region, 138; those supposed to come to Rome really Siceliots, 239

Siculian Sea, termed "Ausonian," 3 f.

Siculus, 13, 14, 298; exile from Rome, 237 f.; name equivalent to Siceliot, 238

Siculus, cognomen of Cloelii, 241

Silae, 57

Silenus, represented on coins, 265, n. 2

Sipontum, in Ausonia, 7; conquered by Alexander, 102

Sirens, Temple of, near Sorrento, 213 ff.; discovery of probable site, 213 ff.; archaic head from, 213; cult of, 215, 222, 230 f.; gave way to cult of Athena, 230

Siris, 32, 36; origin of, chap. v; praised by Archilochus, 68; why thought Colophonian, 72; Rhodians at, 76; date of destruction, 77 f.; use of Achaean alphabet on coins, 78 f.; attacked by Metapontum, Sybaris,

and Croton, 82; alliance with Pyxus, 82 ff.

Siritis, visited by Trojans, 69; considered by Athenians as their property, 75

Sorrento, Temple of Sirens near, 213 ff.; discovery of ancient remains near, 213; used as port of call by Liparaeans, 224

Strabo, legend of Euthymus in, 40; time when wrote Historical Geography 380 ff.; place, 410 ff.; few events referring to period between 7 B. C. and 17 A. D., 405; probably retouched work after 17 A. D., 405, 409; point of view of, 407, 427; date of birth, 410, n. 1; probably wrote away from Rome, 414 ff ; not in Rome after 7 B.C., 414 ff.; travels of in East, 418 ff.; real profession of, 420 f.; called "the Cappadocian," 425

Sulla, policy of toward Naples, 206 f.; preference of for Puteoli, 209 f.

Sybaris, 32; and legend of Euthymus, 45 f.; near Parnassus, 46; in Italy, origin of, 47; alliance of with Locri, 48

Synchronisms, intentional in Roman history, 255 ff., 278, 289, 295 f., 354; refer exclusively to history of Campania, Magna Graecia, and Sicily, 296

Syracusans, occupation of Ischia by, 189 ff.

Syracuse, capture of Piacus by, 123 f.; influence of on Italy proper, 221; transference of history to that of Rome, 255 f., 280, 283 f.; hated by Romans, 267; importance of, 287, 300 f.; coins of found in Etruria, 301, n. 1

Tarentum, 345 ff.; alliance of with Regium, chap. ii, 33 ff.; siege of Romans in citadel of, 87 ff.; and Alexander of Epirus, 102 f.; rupture with Alexander, 104; military superiority over Rome, 323; furnished cult of Dis to Rome, 337

Tarquinii, 272, n. 2

Tauromenium, expedition of Agathocles against, 158 f.; real object, 161 f.; ally of Syracuse, 161; possibly founded by Doric Syracuse, 162

Teanum, 171

Telines, ends secession at Gela, 243 f.; from Telos, 244; connection with Roman secessions, 248 f.

Telmessus, 111, n. 3.

Temesa, an Ausonian city, 3; legend of Euthymus at, 39 ff.; origin of, 40, n. 3; in power of Locrians, 44

Templum, 315, n. 2

Terina, 45, chap. iv; location of, 53; probable existence of two cities of same name, 62; emporium of, 62 f.; coins of, 63 f.; capture of mountain city by Lucanians, 64; capture by Alexander, 65; condition after time of Hannibal, 66

Terinaeus, Sinus, 54

Teuranus, Ager, derivation of name from Terina, 61

Tharros, Greek remains at, 376

Theophilus, of Paphlagonia, 429 f.

Theopompus, 350

Thucydides, account in of defeat at Assinarus, 147 f.; source for all later historians, 156

Thumelicus, 414, n. 2

Thuriae, chap. vii; inscription giving name, 90; probable location of, 92 f., 95 f.; possibly colony of Thurii, 96

Thurii, 321, 330; relation of coinage to that of Apulia, 95; laws of, 332 f.; superiority of code to that of Rome, 334 f.; compulsory education at, 335

Thymbris, 238 f.

Tiber, termed Tybris, 238

Tiberius, mention of later addition by Strabo, 389, 405, 407, 414 f.

Timaeus, one of originators of pseudo-Roman history, 297

Timoleon, 289, 346; resemblance of expedition to that of Alexander, 109; state of Sicily at time of, 347 f.; employment by of mercenaries from Phocaean war, 351 f.

Tin, derived from Sardina by Phoenicians, 378

Tiriolo, site of Terina, 57, 60; founded by Croton, 58; important strategic point, 60

Tombs, resemblance between Sicilian and Etruscan, 271

Tralles, 429; slaughter of Romans at, 429

Tribunate, parallel magistracy to at Syracuse, 260, 280; developed from *προστάται τοῦ δήμου*, 260 ff.; and right

of asylum, 263 f.; introduced from Sicily, 273; date of introduction, 273 f.
Trinacia, account of capture in Diodorus, 123; probably Piacus meant, 124 f.
Triopium, 93
Turnus, termed *Daunius* in Vergil, 167
Tusciano, 166
Tutela, myth of at Rome, 252, n. 5
Twelve Tables, Greek influence on, 329 f.; probable date of, 330; borrowed from different cities, 331 f.
Tybris, 238
Tyndarides, 279

Umbrians of Campania, chap. xv; mentioned by Polybius, 163; allied with Etruscans, 165 f.; traces of in valley of Sarno, 178 f.

Valerius, and secessions of plebs, 242 f., 249
Velia, 250, 309; founding of, 73
Velites, 324
Verruca, la, situation of, 113
Verrugo, 112; same as *civitas Vericulana*, 114
Vesuvius, 173 f.
Vine, importance of to Rome, 313 f., 315 f.; preceded cult of Dionysus at Rome, 314
Virginia, 285, n. 2
Vizzini, possibly site of ancient Echetla, 136
Voltaterrae, 358 f., 364
Volcanic activity, on Ischia, 199 f.
Vonones, 402
Vulcan, cult of at Perugia, 367; associated with cult of Hera, 367 f.; name of early Jupiter at Rome, 368 f.; probable location of temple at Perugia 369; gave way to S. Lorenzo, 369
Vulcanus-Summanus, name of earliest Jupiter at Rome, 368 f.

Ware, Chalcidian, possibly derived from Ischia, 188
Wine, not common in Latium before fourth century, 314; not used in early sacrifices, 315

Xenophanes, allusion in to Colophonian origin of Siris, 72
Χρυσεῖα, on Ischia, probable error for χυτρεῖα, 187 f.

Zaleucus, 48, 331
Zenon, 383
Zeus Eleutherius, 264, n. 1; connected with Demeter, 264

LAKE ERIE COLLEGE LIBRARY

Date Due

LAKE ERIE COLLEGE - LINCOLN LIBRARY
CIRC 937 P16
Pais, Ettore, Ancient Italy;
3 0356 0002 4103 4

937
P16

10698

t Italy